

CHURCH HISTORY

DECEMBER, 1958

Savonarola, Florence, and the
Millenarian Tradition

Donald Weinstein

A Comment on "Savonarola, Florence,
and the Millenarian Tradition"

Marvin B. Becker

The Diplomatic Role of Gasparo
Cardinal Contarini

Heinz Mackensen

The Covenant Idea as a Revolutionary Symbol S. A. Burrell

Protestantism and Capitalism in
Pre-Revolutionary England

Charles and Katherine George



Published by

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1958

George H. Williams	President	Robert S. Michaelson	Asst. Sec.
Robert T. Handy	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. A. Nichols{	Editors
(1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester 20, N. Y.)		F. A. Norwood{	

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sidney E. Mead	H. Shelton Smith
Carl E. Schneider	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Trinterud	Harold Grimm
Quirinus Breen	Lefferts A. Loetscher

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winfred E. Garrison	Harold S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moehlmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loetscher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Pauck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry
Roland H. Bainton	Sandford Fleming

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *CHURCH HISTORY* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *CHURCH HISTORY*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (<i>Divinity School, Yale University</i>)	RAY C. PETRY (<i>Divinity School, Duke University</i>)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	MATTHEW SPINKA (<i>Hartford Theological Seminary, Emeritus</i>)
ROBERT GRANT (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	WILHELM PAUCK (<i>Union Theological Seminary</i>)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (<i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i>)	JOHN DILLENBERGER (<i>Divinity School, Drew University</i>)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (<i>Meadville Theological School</i>)	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (<i>Princeton Theological Seminary</i>)

VOL. XXVII

DECEMBER, 1958

No. 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SAVONAROLA, FLORENCE, AND THE MILLENARIAN TRADITION <i>Donald Weinstein</i>	291
A COMMENT ON "SAVONAROLA, FLORENCE, AND THE MILLENARIAN TRADITION" <i>Marvin B. Becker</i>	306
THE DIPLOMATIC ROLE OF GASPARO CARDINAL CONTARINI AT THE COLLOQUY OF RATISBON OF 1541 <i>Heinz Mackensen</i>	312
THE COVENANT IDEA AS A REVOLUTIONARY SYMBOL: SCOTLAND 1596-1637 <i>S. A. Burrell</i>	338
PROTESTANTISM AND CAPITALISM IN PRE-REVOLUTIONARY ENGLAND <i>Charles and Katherine George</i>	351
IN MEMORIAM: W. W. Rockwell	371

CONTENTS

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS 372

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON AND THE CHRISTOLOGY
OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH | V. C. Samuel |
| THOMAS HOOKER | H. R. Pellman |
| THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECULARISM IN EDUCATION IN
THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY PRIOR TO 1860 | Douglas MacNaughton |
| JOHN FISKE: COSMIC THEIST | H. B. Pannill |

BOOK REVIEWS 374

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| SMITH, W. J.: <i>The Birth of the Gospel</i> | Robert M. Grant |
| CULLMAN, OSCAR: <i>The Early Church</i> | Martin A. Schmidt |
| ORIGEN: <i>Prayer and Exhortation to Martyrdom</i> , trans-
lated by J. J. O'Meara | Samuel Laeuchli |
| MESARITES, NIKOLAOS: <i>Description of the Church of the
Holy Apostles at Constantinople</i> | John E. Rexine |
| DIEHL, CHARLES: <i>Byzantium: Greatness and Decline</i> | Georges Florovsky |
| JEDIN, HUBERT: <i>A History of the Council of Trent.</i>
Vol. I | Elisabeth F. Hirsch |
| CRAGG, G. R.: <i>Puritanism in the Period of the Great
Persecution 1660-1668</i> | J. F. Maclear |
| BEYREUTHER, ERICH: <i>Der Junge Zinzendorf</i> | John R. Weinlick |
| MYKLEBUST, O. G.: <i>The Study of Missions in Theological
Education</i> . Vol. II | R. Pierce Beaver |
| HUGHEY, J. D.: <i>Religious Freedom in Spain</i> | Howard Schomer |
| LANDIS, BENSON Y., ed.: <i>A Rauschenbusch Reader</i> | Donovan E. Smucker |
| NIEBUHR, H. RICHARD and WILLIAMS, DANIEL D., eds.: <i>The
Ministry in Historical Perspectives</i> | Colin W. Williams |

SAVONAROLA, FLORENCE, AND THE MILLENARIAN TRADITION*

DONALD WEINSTEIN, *Roosevelt University*

From the end of 1494 to the spring of 1498 Girolamo Savonarola of Ferrara was a prophet with honor in his adopted country. The Florentines believed in his divine mandate and in his message that the French invader, Charles VIII, was the instrument of God, come to punish the corrupt Church and the sinful Italians and to institute a universal reform. Believing, as he told them, that Florence was divinely chosen to lead the way, the Florentines gave Savonarola the opportunity—rare for prophets—of translating his vision into a practical program. From the pulpit Savonarola taught the first city of the Renaissance how to become the first city of the New Age. Florence, reformed by the friar and his followers, was to be the center from which the spiritual light would illuminate the world.

This episode of the Dominican capturing the hearts and minds of the worldly Florentines has been suggestive to men of every age and ideology. Savonarola has been the occasion for polemic within Catholicism and the hero of movements outside it. To some he has been the saintly exponent of Catholic reform, to others, a rebel against the legitimate authority of the Church.¹ Some Protestants hailed him as a precursor of the Reformation,² and Italian patriots, as a herald of the Risorgimento.³ Still others, convinced of the sharp break between Middle Ages and Renaissance, have seen him as the last ray of the setting medieval sun.⁴ With the passing of time the more anachronistic of these interpretations have faded with the cooling of the polemical ardor which produced them, or have been shattered by sounder historical views. No one, for example, has recently been calling Savonarola a Protestant or a liberal nationalist. Yet, as Giorgio Spini recognized just ten years ago, Savonarola studies are still too often marked by a polemical and unhistorical spirit, still involved in the old questions of the friar's spiritual quality and religious orthodoxy.⁵ This is no less true of the nearly definitive Savonarola biography by Roberto Ridolfi of 1954 than of the great study by Joseph Schnitzer of 1924.⁶

In an effort to get some historical perspective intellectual historians have been directing attention to Savonarola's connections with various ideas and movements of the fifteenth century. But here too there is disagreement. On the one hand Delio Cantimori and Giorgio

*This is a slightly expanded version of a paper read at the 84th meeting of the American Society of Church History, April 18-19, 1958 at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. I should like to acknowledge my great debt to Dr. Hans Baron, Newberry Library, Chicago, for his kind help and advice and to Professor Eugenio Garin, of the University of Florence, from whom I received much aid while doing research on this topic as a Fulbright scholar in Italy, 1953-1955.

Spini have argued that Savonarola was a spokesman for certain eschatological currents of late medieval piety, notably the millenarian ideas of Joachim of Fiore and the tradition which developed after him, chiefly among the Spiritual Franciscans.⁷ Eugenio Garin, on the other hand, emphasizes Savonarola's good relations with the intellectual leaders of Renaissance Florence and attributes some of his main ideas to them. He and André Chastel link Savonarola's idea of a great reform to Marsilio Ficino's neoclassical notion of a golden age.⁸ Professor Garin attributes Savonarola's emphasis upon the spiritual value of contemplation to the influence of his friend, the famous Renaissance personality, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola.⁹

Thus the problem has been set on a sounder historical track, but it remains a problem: what, precisely, was Savonarola's prophetic message: what were its sources? What connections did it have with traditional and newer currents of thought? The most obvious place to begin is with Savonarola's own explanation. To justify himself to the Pope and to his critics, and to spread his message, Savonarola wrote an explanation of his prophecies, a *Compendium Revelationum*, in 1495.¹⁰ Briefly, his account is as follows: God, seeing the sins of Italy multiply, especially the sins of secular and ecclesiastical princes, decided to cleanse His Church with a great punishment (*flagello*) and institute a reform of Christendom. He chose Florence for the announcement of these things because she is in the center of Italy, like a man's heart, and from there the tidings would spread to other parts of the country. He chose Savonarola for His ministry, and arranged for him to come to Florence in 1489, where in the Church of San Marco, he began to preach publicly on the Apocalypse.

Savonarola's account continues. In these sermons he had put forward three predictions: first, the renovation of the Church in those times; second, the punishment of all Italy before the reform began; and, he adds almost superfluously, as a third prediction, the speedy coming of both these events. He said that he labored to persuade his hearers by rational arguments and figures from Scripture, although he himself had received this message from God "in another manner," because men's minds did not yet seem prepared to receive the revelation of such mysteries. As he judged that the public was becoming prepared he began to reveal some of his visions, although still in the form of parables. Even so he suffered from men's scorn, and decided at last to omit all references to visions and the like. But during Lent of 1491 a voice came to him, upbraiding him for not understanding that it was God's will that he announce these things, and the next morning he delivered his famous "terrible sermon," speaking openly the words with which he was divinely inspired.

The *Compendium* was Savonarola's defense against criticism and his apology for claims to be God's prophet. As an apology it presented a very simple explanation of the central question: God revealed His plan to Savonarola and sent him to Florence, the city chosen as the starting point of the reform. In contrast to the *Compendium*, however, evidence from Savonarola's sermons and from a study of his career in Florence suggests a more complicated development of his prophecy. In the *Compendium* he gives the impression that his mission as a prophet began upon his arrival in Florence in 1489, but in reality he had first come to the city in 1482 and stayed until 1487, when he left, not to return until 1490, not 1489.¹¹ These chronological discrepancies are connected with problems about Savonarola's prophecy itself. He had begun formulating his prediction of the coming tribulations *during* his first stay in Florence, not before his arrival, and he began to prophesy in the neighboring town of San Gimignano, not in Florence.¹² In fact, there is no record of his having delivered his prophecies in Florence at all by the time he left the city in 1487.

Still more important, the prophecy of these earlier years was not the same as the message Savonarola announced during the French invasions of 1494. It was neither millennial in content nor specifically Florentine in direction.¹³ There is, then, a change in his prophecy, a progression from concern with tribulation and the Last Days to a conviction of triumph and fulfillment which the *Compendium* obscures and modern studies have not adequately recognized.¹⁴ This factor of development is a significant key to a fuller understanding of Savonarola's message.

To be sure, the idea that the world was in an evil period had been with Savonarola for a long time. In a poem he had written in 1472, when he was twenty, he had complained that the world was upside down and every virtue spent. St. Peter's and Rome, having abandoned their great office, were headed for ruin. The Final Day, when God would punish the world, was coming.¹⁵ These ideas of corruption and the failure of Rome's leadership led him to search the Scriptures, where he found evidence that the tribulations of the Apocalypse were imminent. In his earliest prophetic sermons in San Gimignano he sounded a stronger apocalyptic note. His text was from Matthew (3.2, 4.17), "Do penance for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."¹⁶ There is yet no trace in these sermons of the hope for a universal reform or the prophecy of a New Day.

When he returned to Florence in 1490 he announced his message of tribulations in sermons on the Apocalypse and the First Epistle of John.¹⁷ The world was full of pride and blasphemy, and therefore, as the abbot Joachim of Fiore and St. Vincent of Ferrer had said, the

time was at hand. After six days, when men had escaped from the toils of material things, the sun would open and illuminate the world; men would be brought to the mountain of contemplation, where they would have revelation and knowledge (*scientia*) of the Old and the New Testaments.¹⁸ As he cited Joachim of Fiore, the father of the most powerful of medieval millennial doctrines, so some of his contemporaries accused Savonarola of adhering to this dangerous teaching.¹⁹ But he also cited St. Vincent of Ferrer, who, earlier in the century, had prophesied the coming end of the world, not the millennium.²⁰ Savonarola's eschatology was vague and uncertain at this time. His chief interest was individual conversion and reform, his chief source, the Bible, which he read more in the moralizing spirit of the Old Testament prophets than with the elaborate millenarian exegesis of a Joachim of Fiore. The most striking aspects of his later prophecy—the special eschatological role for Florence and the idea of a world reform, are not evident in these sermons nor in those of the years immediately succeeding.

Fra Placido Cinozzi describes how Savonarola's reputation grew steadily, so that he soon became the foremost preacher in the city.²¹ He outstripped a number of rivals, of whom the foremost was Fra Mariano da Genazzano, a Friar Hermit of St. Augustine favored by the Medici, whose sermons, polished with classical learning, had been the delight of Poliziano and other humanists of the Medici circle.²² Savonarola's fare was more exciting than the humanist-preacher's. His attraction lay not, as with Fra Mariano, in the elegance and learning of his style, but in the sensational content of his prophetic message.²³ Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, one of his earliest biographers, said that to those who had heard him preach before he had begun to prophesy the change seemed a miracle; his listeners were rapt, as he penetrated their hearts rather than their ears, talking of the coming destruction and the reform of the Church (*spiritualis instauratio*).²⁴ He made pointed remarks about tyrants, who must come to a bad end.²⁵ Lords, he said, built lavishly in order to render themselves immortal; in the meantime they oppressed the poor, violating the natural law of brotherly love.²⁶ The poor had only their labors, pressed down by taxes which went to pay for palaces and prostitutes. Nor could they even enjoy charity any longer; the *grandi* were too concerned with their sensual pleasures.²⁷

For this championing of the poor Savonarola was sneeringly referred to as "the preacher of the desperate."²⁸ But his criticism did not lead him into the arena of political reform. Neither did he follow the direction of those medieval radical millenarian movements which sprang from poverty and social protest.²⁹ He was still a moralist and

a penitential preacher rather than a political reformer or a millenarian. His chief concern was the corruption of the Church and the decay of individual virtue, rather than social injustice or the lack of political liberty. This is true as late as early 1494, when he delivered Lenten sermons calling for the building of a Noah's ark against the coming flood.³⁰

Yet, by the time Savonarola wrote the *Compendium of Revelations* in 1495 he had elaborated his famous message. What accounts for the change? Savonarola wrote the *Compendium* in the spring and summer, that is, in the months just following the French invasion and the political upheaval in Florence. During that time Charles VIII had marched through Italy with shocking ease, the Medici had been evicted from Florence, and the aspiring Florentine oligarchy thwarted by a popular movement. Savonarola had become the spiritual father of the city, if not its effective ruler, and the head of the popular party. He became the city's principal ambassador to Charles VIII, and his was the strongest voice in maintaining that the destinies of Florence were bound up with those of the French king, God's avenging instrument. Moreover, the reform of the Florentine government proceeded along lines either suggested or supported by the friar from his pulpit. That the crisis of October-November 1494 was the turning point in Savonarola's career has always been evident. That this crisis was also the turning point in his development as a prophet needs demonstration. It becomes clear, however, when we compare the imprecise ideas of Savonarola's earlier preaching with the message which emerged in his sermons during this period of crisis.

When Charles VIII penetrated Tuscany there was great alarm in Florence on account of the anti-French policy which the Medici government had been pursuing. Piero de' Medici himself, trying to avert complete catastrophe, rushed to the camp of the king and quickly ceded to him the Florentine border fortresses and the two port cities of Pisa and Livorno. At home in Florence this action seemed a blow to civic honor and a disastrous surrender of hard-won positions. It was the culmination of a long series of unpopular actions by Piero de' Medici, the last straw, in fact, and when he hurried back to the city he found the governmental palace barred to him and the people menacing him in the streets. Failing to rouse support Piero and his brothers rode out the Bologna gate to exile. Sixty years of Medici primacy in Florence were over.³¹

Just as Charles was entering Tuscany and preparing to march on Pisa, the greatest prize in Florence's possession, Savonarola ascended the pulpit of the Cathedral, to begin a course of sermons which lasted to the end of the year.³² Now he was triumphant. He recalled

his prophecies of the coming deluge. He had announced the tribulations, he had seen the divine sword over Italy, and so it had come to pass. But already we can detect a change from his earlier preaching. He had foretold punishment for all of Italy, with special force against Rome. Now, in the first of these November sermons, he spoke directly to Florence. As the predicted vengeance seemed suddenly to be concentrating upon this one city, so it appeared that God's message had been directed to her. God had chosen him to illuminate this city rather than other places, and her failure to listen was now bearing its bitter fruit. In other respects, however, his message was the same as before. He made no promise of special treatment for Florence; she was to suffer in the general punishment. At the most he could offer the consolations of prayer and repentance which would help the Florentines withstand the trials to come.³³

A few days after he began these sermons he was elected to an embassy to the French king at Pisa, where, according to a contemporary chronicler, he reminded Charles of the ancient alliance between Florence and the House of Anjou in the interest of liberty.³⁴ From this time, moreover, he continually reminded Charles of the king's divine mission to institute the great reform.³⁵ While Savonarola was away from Florence the revolution against the Medici took place. The impact of this event was immediately reflected in Savonarola's sermons upon his return from Pisa. Now he understood that the problem of religious reform in Florence was connected with the problem of government. Like the traveler to Jericho (Luke 10.30-5) the Florentines had been in the hands of thieves. The Samaritan, who is Christ, had helped them, giving them over to the care of the innkeeper, who was the friar himself, while the two pence He had given them were the Old and the New Testaments.³⁶ The fact that their first trial had passed without bloodshed was suggestive to him: it was necessary to see, he said, whether God had been more merciful to this city than to the others. In the meantime the Florentines were to continue to build their spiritual ark against the coming flood, and if they persevered they would continue to be consoled.³⁷

The flood came soon. Charles VIII entered Florence on November 17, with armor and canopy, the symbols of the conqueror. Several times it seemed that he would put the city to sack. But after considerable argument, in which Savonarola was twice called upon to intervene with the king, the Florentines and the French resumed their old alliance.³⁸ Charles marched out with his army on November 28, bound for the conquest of Naples. The Florentines then turned to the ordering of their domestic affairs, and a few days later the beginnings of the post-Medicean republic were laid by a sovereign assembly of the people.

These two events, the passing of the French armies and the uprooting of the Medici regime, had an important effect upon Savonarola's prophetic message. Previously he had only expressed the hope that Florence might be spared punishment. Now that the danger was passed it seemed clear that Florence was chosen for divine favor.³⁹ The flood she had escaped was the divine instrument for the reform of the Church. The people in the ark, the Florentines, were to be the bearers of the reform.⁴⁰

Now, moreover, the political revolution took on more significance, and Savonarola's vision of the city's task began to emerge. Florence was a "new city," but she had to consolidate her formal revolution with an internal, spiritual one.⁴¹ For the first time Savonarola, fortified by his own active role in the recent events and his increased authority, chose to give direct advice on the governing of the city, and he gave it as part of his divine mandate. In Florence, he said, where men were especially rich in spirit and talent, dissension arose easily and soon led to despotism, despotism to corruption and spiritual decay.⁴² Now, for the first time, he attacked the Medici regime directly.⁴³ Only by insuring against its reappearance could the civic reform be protected.⁴⁴ Florence needed a republic which followed a careful course between oligarchy on the one side and mob rule on the other. Publicly in the pulpit, privately in meetings with political leaders he urged his program: the French alliance, the ending of civic conflict, the modeling of a government upon the Venetian constitution, with its safeguards against extremes.⁴⁵ In this context he conceived his idea of taking Christ as king of Florence. Making Christ king, he pointed out, meant standing under His law. Through the contemplation of Christ the people would learn to unite in His love and the love of their neighbors. This would bring about the civic reconciliation of factions, and Florence could attend to its work as the city of reform for Italy and the world.⁴⁶

With the growing conviction that Florence, the republic of Christ, had a mission to fulfill, Savonarola found new meaning in the Scriptures. He had always gone to the Bible for his inspiration, but now he read it with a sharper sense of its application to the immediate situation. He had been preaching on Genesis, concentrating on the analogy between the Italian crisis and the Flood. With the change in government and the peaceful departure of Charles' army he switched texts, taking up Haggai, the prophet who had preached to the Jews after their return from captivity. Haggai had inspired the building of the new temple, promising that it would be more glorious than the first. Savonarola likewise urged *his* followers to build a new temple, the new regime in Florence, and in his second sermon on Haggai he made

his electrifying prophecy:⁴⁷

... I announced this good news to the city, that Florence will be more glorious, richer, more powerful than she has ever been.

First, glorious in the sight of God as well as of men: and you, oh Florence, will be the reformation of all Italy, and from here the renewal will begin and spread over all, because this is the umbilicus of Italy. Your councils will reform all by the light and grace that God will give you. Second, oh Florence, you will have innumerable riches, and God will multiply all things for you. Third, you will spread your empire, and thus you will have power temporal and spiritual.

The two main parts of this declaration—the concept of Florence as the vital center of the reform, and the promise of Florentine wealth, power and glory—appear here for the first time. The declaration climaxed a period of development which is to be traced from the beginning of the Florentine crisis. In this time Savonarola found new meaning in Scripture which helped him to understand what was happening more clearly than before. Allegory now was to him not only the prefiguration of the New Testament in the Old but the prefiguration of the New Day beginning in his own times, and of Florence's mission. For instance, the story of the Sunamite woman in Kings (4 Kings 4 in the Douai, 2 Kings 4 in the King James version) referred not only to the Incarnation and the reform of the Church in a general sense but also to Florence, "the Florentine Church," and the new reform coming.⁴⁸ Similarly, Jerusalem became for Savonarola a symbol of Florence. God wanted to build a new city, which would no longer be Florence but a New Jerusalem, holy and peaceful, the leader of the restored Church in the New Age.⁴⁹ Here Savonarola's preaching, vaguely apocalyptic and predominantly penitential in 1490, began to take its ultimately millenarian form. In the fourteenth sermon on Haggai, Savonarola turned back to the seven-day scheme of the Apocalypse, investing it with a more precise, more clearly millennial interpretation than he had done earlier. The world was in transition from the fourth age, the age of the pale horse and of those indifferent about religion. The fifth age, of Antichrist and conversion, was beginning. After the reform, in which Florence would become the city of God, renewed, like Jerusalem, with the rebuilding of the temple, the infidels and pagans would convert to Christianity.⁵⁰ With the spread of Florentine influence over the earth men would rest in the recreated Church (*Chiesa renovata*), turn from worldly affairs to the love of divine things, and the Church would be glorious throughout the world.⁵¹ Thus Savonarola brought promises of a New Age instead of warnings of the Last Days. His vision of the Seventh Day was close to the Joachimites' idea of a World Sabbath, and his prophecy of the coming Holy or Angelic Pope who would reduce the world to one sheep-fold under one pastor was a common Joachimite figure.⁵² He represented Charles VIII in terms akin to the

Joachimites' prophecy of a New Charlemagne who would take up a crusade to the East.⁵³

But though Savonarola used some of the themes and figures which had long been circulated by the epigoni of Joachim of Fiore, his own form of millenarianism was of a different spirit. Joachimism rejected the idea of a single Christian dispensation in favor of the concept of the continuing revelation of God in history. Savonarola was not interested in speculations of this nature, and continued to refer to Scripture as the ultimate source of Christian knowledge. The Joachimites emphasized that in the third age of the Holy Spirit, the secular Church would give way to a rule of monks. Savonarola saw Florence as the nucleus of the coming millennial world community and foretold that Florence would be the New Jerusalem, but he did not prophesy a change in the organization of the Church as such. In fact he expressly denied this.⁵⁴ The Joachimite prophecy was based on an original and abstract Biblical exegesis. Savonarola's prophecy was more *ex tempore*, forged out of the fervor of daily events; his spirit the spirit of Old Testament prophetism, his exegesis inspired rather than studied.

As for the attribution of Savonarola's ideas to the influence of contemporary Florentine thinkers, here too important distinctions must be made. Intellectual circles in Florence were interested in religious reform, and there was, with the help of astrology, considerable expectation and prediction of a coming great revival.⁵⁵ But Savonarola's expectation of reform had other sources. His main inspiration was, as already noted, the Bible, and for him reform was based upon individual conversion of life. For the men of Pico's and Ficino's circles, the religious revival would follow the revival of ancient learning and philosophy. Ficino saw the decline of Christianity as a problem of the separation between philosophy and religion, and the reform as a consequence of their reunion.⁵⁶ In short, the Florentine thinkers called for a republic of letters,⁵⁷ while Savonarola called for a republic of virtue, in which learning would have a subordinate place. He was no obscurantist but he did not believe learning was the way to God. As he put it, we cannot know God by studying Cicero and Aristotle.⁵⁸ Ficino's concept of a Platonic theology, and Pico's belief in a reconciliation of all the great philosophies and religions in a world system were equally alien to him.

But if Savonarola differed with the men of the advanced circles of Florence over the nature of the religious revival, he shared with them one fundamental conviction: the center of the great awakening would be in Florence. Savonarola's message, that a free republican Florence would be the vital center of Italy and of the New Age, was not only a prophecy but also a restatement of a traditional theme of Florentine thought. From the Middle Ages Florentine historians had written of

the city's peculiar heritage and destiny. Florence was the daughter and heiress of Rome, founded by Caesar, rebuilt by Charlemagne. Dante referred to this legend, calling Florence the most beautiful and famous daughter of Rome,⁵⁹ and Giovanni Villani added that, while Rome was in decline, her daughter Florence was mounting and pursuing great causes.⁶⁰ Hans Baron has shown how this legend had been adapted to changing political circumstances by Florentine humanist historians.⁶¹ In the struggle for Florence's independence against the expanding power of Milan at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Florentines had begun to think of themselves as the champions of liberty. The Guelph tradition of Florentine loyalty to the Papal against the Imperial party they redefined as a tradition of Florentine leadership for liberty in central Italy. Inspired by Florence's successful resistance to the Visconti of Milan, Leonardo Bruni rewrote the legend of the city's Roman origin. Florence, he said, was founded not by servile Romans under the rule of Caesar, but by free Romans imbued with the *virtus* of the pre-Caesarian Republic. Thus, he concluded, Florence inherited the Roman legacy of freedom which she carried on in her Guelph leadership and her republican institutions. Bruni had also discovered a connection between Florentine liberty and Florentine leadership in the progress of Renaissance culture. The free civic institutions nurtured the humanist studies of free men, and from Florence these studies took root in Italy.

So the tradition of Florentine preeminence had been formed and established, although, during the sixty years of Medici control, civic writers had made more of Florentine cultural leadership than of her leadership for liberty. To take a few examples: in 1455 Alamanno Rinuccini wrote to tell the philosopher Argyropolous that in Florence he would find a city not only unsurpassed in beauty and agreeableness but also far outdistancing the rest in humanist studies.⁶² The poet Ugolino Verino, later a friend of Savonarola, called attention to the two-fold growth of Florence, in the arts and in her *imperium*, from the time of Dante. Florence's leadership, Verino wrote, was such that the golden age of the past had to give way to that of the present.⁶³ Perhaps the best known version of this theme is in Marsilio Ficino's letter to Paul of Middelburg, in which Ficino rejoiced in the revival of learning and the arts in Florence which was ushering in the golden age, formerly thought to be in the past.⁶⁴

Savonarola borrowed directly from this patriotic tradition. His constant references to Florence as the center of Italy, the home of its most intelligent men, his statements that Rome must give way while Florence would prosper, echo the civic writers. Like Coluccio Salutati he called Florence the umbilicus of Italy, and as Salutati had done, he spoke of Florence's election.⁶⁵ His reference to Florence's superior

"spirit and talent" recalls Gregorio Dati's phrase, "art and talent,"⁶⁶ and his prophecy of the illumination of Italy by Florence recalls the panegyric of the humanist Pandolfo Collenuccio, who used the same figure of illumination in discussing Florence.⁶⁷

Savonarola, moreover, once again related this theme of Florentine leadership to the ideal of civic liberty. The report of his appeal to the old Guelph alliance with Charles of Anjou in his embassy to Charles VIII, mentioned earlier, may have been a fabrication, but it is significant that the chronicler, a partisan of Savonarola, linked the friar with the tradition of civic liberty.⁶⁸ In his work for the establishment of the Republic, Savonarola was the declared pupil of Leonardo Bruni and the heir of the patriotic historians. From Villani to Guicciardini Florentine historians read the city's history as a dialectic between factions, parties or classes. They saw the problem of the Republic as one of preventing internal strife and the consequent rise of despotism. Bruni had established the connection between Florence's liberty and her preeminence in culture. After this relationship had been minimized during the Medici period Savonarola called attention to it once more. He appealed to Florentine history to prove that the republic was the traditional, as it was the natural, form for this city so rich in men of spirit and talent. He appealed to the testimony of the civic chroniclers for proof that Florentines had always been terrible against tyranny, monarchy and aristocracy.⁶⁹ Any attempt to go against nature and tradition, he said, would lead to a new loss of freedom. Moreover, Savonarola's appeal to Florentine traditions was no mere generality. He cited Leonardo Bruni and he showed that he had read that humanist.⁷⁰ With Bruni he shared a strong feeling for a so-called "popular" republic—one which would prevent the rule of one man or a few by constitutional safeguards, where liberty would grow out of equal treatment by the laws. With Bruni also he shared a faith that civic liberty was the foundation of Florentine greatness in Italy and in the world.

For Savonarola, Florence's leadership would be primarily spiritual, rather than cultural as it was for the humanists; yet how much his message reflected of secular patriotism! Florence would be "richer, more glorious, more powerful than ever." Pisa would be returned. Florence would spread her *imperium* and her power, temporal as well as spiritual. Like his humanist predecessors Savonarola seemed to feel no conflict between his exaltation of Florentine liberty and his promises of the extension of her hegemony. These were prophecies closer to the hearts of the bourgeois Florentines than was the monastic-centered millennialism of the Joachimites or the esoteric theosophizing of Ficino's circle; far closer, indeed, than Savonarola's own earlier condemnations of worldly wealth and his identification with the cause of the "desperate."

Savonarola's absorption of these views indicates that, while the crisis of November 1494 was decisive in the elaboration of his millenarian prophecy, we must look further back to find the explanation of his identification with Florentine secular interests. Indeed, in the four years of his successful preaching in Florence strong ties binding him to the city, ties of mutual interest and affection, grew in a number of ways, and he had become a Florentine in outlook. We may never know fully why Lorenzo de' Medici had Savonarola recalled to Florence in 1490,⁷¹ but we do know that in several respects the friar's preaching served Florentine interests very well. His first prophecies of the punishment of Rome in 1483 came when Florence was at war with Pope Sixtus IV; his San Gimignano prophecies, when she was at war with Innocent IV. His success in founding an independent Tuscan congregation of Dominican houses was in line with the Medici policy of Florentine expansion in Tuscany. It removed one source of outside interference in the city's affairs and gave Florence an excuse for further interference in the affairs of her Tuscan neighbors.

In 1491 Savonarola had been elected prior of San Marco. The wandering mendicant preacher now held important dignities in the city. He had become a Florentine by adoption. Not only this, but his fight for the independence of the Tuscan Dominican houses from the Lombard Congregation made Savonarola dependent upon the protecting walls of Florence. At the time of the separation he was ordered to appear before the vicar-general of the Lombard Congregation but refused to go. Later, as he continued to thwart papal efforts to break the alliance between Florence and France, the Pope used this matter of the Dominican quarrel to bring him down. He was ordered to unite the Tuscan houses with a new Roman-Tuscan congregation. When he refused he was excommunicated, thereby becoming entirely dependent upon the shifting winds of popularity within Florence.⁷²

Savonarola not only identified himself with Florentine political interests, he also played a role in the city's intellectual life. A Medici foundation, San Marco had always served the intellectual and artistic community, and it continued to do so under Savonarola's priorate. Savonarola was Giovanni Pico's spiritual advisor and he helped with Pico's polemic against astrology.⁷³ Three of his closest friends were the brothers Domenico, Girolamo and Antonio Benivieni, philosophers and members of the Medici Platonic circle.⁷⁴ Giovanni Nesi, Neoplatonist poet and Florentine man of affairs, was his strongest supporter, and referred to the friar as the "Socrates of Ferrara."⁷⁵ This list of friends and followers from the Florentine intelligentsia could be greatly extended; suffice it to mention that Piero Crinito, a pupil of the humanist Politian, referred to Savonarola as "the best informed man in philosophy

of his time," and called San Marco, in humanist fashion, the Marcian Academy.⁷⁶

Such were the sources and varieties of Savonarola's identification with the Florence of the humanists, the Medici, and the Platonic Academy. This identification helped lay the foundations for his prophetic message and determined that it would have the civic, patriotic character which it did later assume. The prophecy that Savonarola announced in November, 1494 was different both in spirit and in detail from his earlier message. He read the Bible in a new way and his vision of the New Jerusalem was inspired by the immediate impact of Florentine and Italian events as well as by the more subtle effect of his growing identification with Florentine interests and traditions. His version of the reform and the millennium was permeated with concepts drawn from Florentine civic thought. His promise that Florence would be richer, more powerful, more glorious than ever was a new secularization of the eschatological theme. If earlier prophecies of a reforming Emperor had reflected the political world of the Middle Ages, Savonarola's message bore the stamp of the city-state society of fifteenth century Italy and reflected the preeminence of Florence in the Renaissance. It was his genius for combining the traditional appeal of the penitential preacher with the religious as well as the material ambitions of Renaissance Florence into a Biblical vision of the New Jerusalem which makes Savonarola an interesting figure for historical study. Neither a spokesman for a dead past nor for an unborn future, he was a prophet for the fifteenth century, with its living religious interests and its tensions between the spirit and the flesh.

1. See for example the defense of Savonarola by Lorenzo Luotto against the criticisms of Ludwig Pastor, *Il vero Savonarola e il Savonarola di L. Pastor* (Florence, 1897).
2. There is a good survey of Savonarola interpretations in Joseph Schnitzer, *Savonarola ein Kulturbild aus der Zeit der Renaissance* 2 vols. (Munich, 1924). I cite the expanded and revised Italian translation by Ernesto Rutili (Milan, 1931) II, chap. 40. See also Alfred Teichmann, *Savonarola in der deutschen Dichtung (Stoff- und Motivgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 16; Berlin, 1937).
3. For an account of the "new piagnonism" of the nineteenth century see Giovanni Gentile, *Gino Cappaci e la cultura toscana nel secolo decimonono* (Florence, 1922).
4. The metaphor is used by Francesco De Sanctis, quoted by Luigi Russo, *Machiavelli* (3d ed; Bari, 1949) p. 2.
5. Giorgio Spini, "Introduzione al Savonarola," *Belfagor* III, 4 (31 July, 1948) pp. 414-428. See also Delio Cantimori, "Giuseppe Schnitzer: Savonarola," *Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Lettere, Storia e Filosofia* II (1932) pp. 80-104, and Roberto Palmarocchi, "Savonarola, Girolamo," *Enciclopedia italiana* XXX (1936) pp. 973-5.
6. Roberto Ridolfi, *Vita di Girolamo Savonarola* 2 vols. (Rome, 1954); Schnitzer, *op. cit.*
7. Spini, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-421; Cantimori, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-100.
8. Of the many works of Eugenio Garin I mention here only the one most pertinent to this specific point: "Girolamo Savonarola," Address to the Libera Cattedra of Florence (Florence, 1953); André Chastel, "L'Antéchrist à la Renaissance," *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi Umanistici* ed. Enrico Castelli, *L'Umanesimo e il demoniaco nell'arte* (Rome, 1952) pp. 177-186.

9. Eugenio Garin, "Desideri di riforma nell' oratoria del Quattrocento," *Bel-fagor Quaderno I, Contributi alla storia del Concilio di Trento e della controriforma* (Florence, 1948) p. 9.
10. There are numerous editions in Italian and Latin. I cite that in Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, *Vita R.P. Fr. Hieronymi Savonarola Ferrariensis* 2 vols. ed. Jacques Quetif (Paris, 1674) I, 221-230.
11. Ridolfi, *Vita I*, 20-45. See also Ridolfi, *Studi savonaroliani* (Florence, 1935) pp. 34-71.
12. See the record of his trial published in Pasquale Villari, *La storia di Girolamo Savonarola e di suoi tempi* 2 vols. (2d ed. Florence, 1887-8) I, cxlix-cl. This is confirmed by the account of Savonarola's devoted disciple and biographer, Fra Benedetto Luschino (da Firenze), who also reports that Savonarola told him how his first idea of the coming punishment and renovation of the Church came to him through reason and the reading of Scriptures. *Vulnera diligentis* Ms. Biblioteca Riccardiana (Florence) No. 2985, Book III, f. 15r.
13. The Latin notes for one of these San Gimignano sermons are published in Roberto Ridolfi, *Gli archivi delle famiglie fiorentine* (Florence, 1934) pp. 79-81.
14. Professor Cantimori, in his review of Schnitzer, observes the absence of any sense of spiritual development in Schnitzer's interpretation of Savonarola, and notes that Schnitzer interpreted Savonarola's early thought on the basis of expressions only found in his later work. *op. cit.*, p. 91.
15. In Mario Ferrara, *Savonarola* 2 vols (Florence, 1952) I, 7-9.
16. Ridolfi, *Studi* p. 45.
17. Ridolfi, *Vita I*, 52-3.
18. Girolamo Savonarola, "Lezioni sull' Apocalisse," partly in Villari, *Savonarola*, I, xv-xviii. The full text is in *Sermones sive magis lectiones super Apocalypsim* Ms. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (Florence) Conventi soppressi No. I. VII 25, ff. 53-85.
19. See for example the attack by the hermit Angelo, *Epistola dell' heremita de Valle Ombrosa dello stato della Chiesa* (Vallombrosa, 1496) Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (Florence) Guicciardini No. 3-10-7.
20. "Vincenzo Ferreri (Ferrer) santo," *Enciclopedia Cattolica* (Vatican City, 1954) XII, 1444.
21. In P. Villari, E. Casanova (ed.) *Scelta di prediche e scritti di Fra Girolamo Savonarola* (Florence, 1898) p. 15.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 14. On Fra Mariano see D. A. Perini, *Un emulo di fr. Girolamo Savonarola: fr. Mariano da Genazzano* (Rome, 1917).
23. Girolamo Benivieni tells how his brother Domenico criticized Savonarola for the lack of grace in his style, especially as compared to Fra Mariano: *Lettera mandata a Clemente VII* (1530) Ms. Biblioteca Riccardiana (Florence) f. 8 v-r.
24. Gianfrancesco Pico, *Vita I*, 27.
25. Girolamo Savonarola, *Prediche nuovamente venute in luce.... sopra il salmo Quam bonus Israel Deus* (Venice, 1528) f. LII v.
26. *Ibid.*, ff. LXII r-LXVIII v.
27. *Ibid.*, f. XI r.
28. Girolamo Savonarola, *Prediche italiane ai Fiorentini* 3 vols. in 4, ed. F. Cognasso, R. Palmarocchi (Documenti di storia italiana; Perugia, Florence, 1930-5) II, 318-19.
29. The social basis of medieval millenarian movements is most recently discussed in Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1957).
30. Girolamo Savonarola, *Sermones quadraginta super archam Noe* (Venice, 1536). For the dating of these sermons see *Bibliografia delle opere di Savonarola* ed. Piero Ginori Conti, Vol. I Roberto Ridolfi, *Cronologia e bibliografia delle prediche* (Florence, 1939) pp. 40-6.
31. These events are described in Schnitzer, *op. cit.*, I, 163-212, and Ridolfi, *Vita I*, 116-126.
32. These make up the first volume of the *Prediche italiane ai fiorentini op. cit.*
33. *Ibid.*, I, 9-19.
34. Bartolomeo Cerretani, *Storia fiorentina* in Joseph Schnitzer (ed.) *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Savonarolas III. Bartolomeo Cerretani* (Munich, 1904) pp. 15-16.
35. See his letters to Charles, nos. XX, XXVII-XXIX in *Le lettere* ed. Roberto Ridolfi (Florence, 1933).
36. *Prediche italiane I*, 55-6.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
38. This is described in Cerretani, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-7; Luca Landucci, *Diario fiorentino* ed. Iodoco Del Badia (Florence, 1883) pp. 87-8. The text of the agreement is in *Archivio storico italiano* 1 (1842) pp. 362-375.
39. "...però el nostro Noè che è nell' arca parla a tutti quelli che sono dentro, intra i quali noi siamo da Dio stati eletti a fuggire tanto pericolo." *Prediche italiane I*, 107.
40. "Risponde Noè: Si come per el diluvio si rinnovò el mondo, così manda Dio queste tribulazioni per rinnovare la chiesa sua con quelli che staranno nell' arca." *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9.
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

43. The point is important in following the development of Savonarola's message. Francesco Guicciardini noticed it: *Storie fiorentine* p. 109 in *Opere* ed. Roberto Palmarocchi (Scrittori d'Italia 134; Bari, 1931).
44. *Prediche italiane* I, 115.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 195-7.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 362-3.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-1.
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 201; II, 324-5.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 201-214.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 269-275.
52. For his use of the Biblical *unum ovile* (e.g. John 10.16) see *Prediche italiane* III², 206, 256. For the *Papa santo* see *Ibid.*, pp. 313-4, 528. The Joachimites also used the terms *Papa sanctus* and *pastor bonus*: see K. Burdach, P. Piur, (ed.) *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation; Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildung* II. 5, 307-8.
53. On the Joachimites "Second Charlemagne" Prophecy see especially Margorie E. Reeves, *Studies in the Reputation and Influence of the Abbot Joachim of Fiore, Chiefly in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1932).
54. Savonarola, *Le lettere*, p. 42.
55. On reforming interests in Florence see Garin, "Desideri," and the resumé in my thesis, *Prophecy and Humanism in Late Fifteenth Century Florence* (Ph. D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1957) Chap. II. On the astrological predictions of religious reform see Benedetto Soldati, *La poesia astrologica nel Quattrocento* (Florence, 1906) pp. 196-7; Chastel, *op. cit.*, *passim*.
56. See especially Marsilio Ficino, *Della religione christiana* (Florence, 1568) pp. 7-8.
57. Eugenio Garin, *L'umanesimo italiano* (Bari, 1952) p. 114.
58. *Prediche italiane* III¹, 151, 400.
59. Quoted by Mario Salmi, "La 'Renovatio Romae' e Firenze," *Rinascimento* I (Florence, 1950) 20-1.
60. Quoted by Ferdinand Schervill, *History of Florence* (New York, 1936) p. 228.
61. Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* 2 vols. (Princeton, 1955) I, 38-60.
62. Alamanno Rinuccini, *Lettere ed orazioni* ed. Vito R. Giustiniani (Florence, 1953) p. 14.
63. Ugolino Verino, *Flametta* ed. Luciano Mencaraglia (Florence, 1940) p. 96. I have so far only been able to see reviews of Warman Welliver's *L'impero fiorentino* (Florence, 1957). If his thesis is correct Lorenzo de' Medici was responsible for developing a program of Florentine imperialism. This would, it seems to me, strengthen further the bonds between Savonarola's prophecy and Florentine traditions.
64. Marsilio Ficino, *Opera* (Basel, 1561) pp. 616-617.
65. See Salutati's panegyric in Eugenio Garin (ed.) *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (Milan, 1953) p. 34.
66. Baron, *op. cit.*, I, 152-3.
67. In Eugenio Garin (ed.) *Il Rinascimento italiano* (Milan, 1941) p. 371.
68. In explaining the Florentine reception of Charles VIII Comines says, "... les Florentins mal volontiers estoient contre la maison de France, de laquelle ilz ont esté de tous temps vrayes serviteurs et partisans, tant pour les affaires qu'ilz ont en France, pour la marchandise, que pour estre de la part guelfe: ..." *Memoires de Philippe De Comynes* ed. R. Chantelauze (Paris, 1881) p. 536. I am indebted to Dr. Hans Baron for this reference.
69. Girolamo Savonarola, *Trattato circa il reggimento e governo della città di Firenze* ed. A. de Rians (6th ed., Florence, 1847) p. 13.
70. Girolamo Savonarola, *Prediche sopra Ezechiele* ed. Roberto Ridolfi 2 vols. (Rome, 1955) I, 97.
71. We do know that Giovanni Pico had met Savonarola earlier and interceded with Lorenzo to secure the return of the friar to Florence. *La vita del Beato Ieronimo Savonarola scritta da un anonimo* ed. Piero Ginori Conti (Florence, 1937) p. 17. For further evidence see Ridolfi, *Vita* I, 43-4.
72. On Savonarola's work for Dominican reform see Joseph Schnitzer, *Savonarola im Streite mit seinem Orden und seinem Kloster* (Munich, 1914).
73. As their mutual friend and disciple, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di de Novo Saeculo* (Florence, 1947) b. 4 r.
74. On Domenico see Arnaldo Della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (Florence, 1902) pp. 771-2. On Girolamo see Caterina Re, *Girolamo Benivieni fiorentino* (Città di Castello, 1906). On Antonio see Della Torre, *op. cit.*, pp. 780-3. See also my thesis, Chap. IV.
75. "Ferrariensis igitur Socrates," Nesi, *op. cit.*, b. 5 r.
76. Piero Crinito, *De honesta disciplina* ed. Carlo Angieleri (Edizione nazionale dei classici del pensiero italiano II.2; Rome, 1955) pp. 104-5.

A COMMENT ON "SAVONAROLA, FLORENCE, AND THE MILLENARIAN TRADITION"

MARVIN B. BECKER, *Western Reserve University*

It appears to me that the strength of Professor Weinstein's inquiry is predicated upon the concreteness of his approach and his unwillingness to take refuge in those abstractions which are not infrequently found in the realm of Medieval and Renaissance studies. Therefore, the hypothesis that he advances stems from data, rather than from an unverifiable assumption about the nature of man or of thought in the *Quattrocento*. Another quality which is evident in his paper is his commitment to a type of research which is essentially an adventure. This figure of speech is intended to suggest that he is trying to isolate and then delineate a problem. In this instance, the unknown quantity is the boundary line that separates the historical from the a-historical. As a result of his search, he is compelled to modify the interpretations of Garin and Cantimori. His explanation is based upon the decisive role that historical circumstance and Florentine tradition (possibly two facets of a single entity) played in forging the prophetic message of Savonarola. Therefore, he locates the center of gravity of the Dominican's teachings "in tempore," rather than in the a-historical "world of ideas." For Professor Weinstein, the boundaries of Savonarola's prophecies are generated by "the fervor of daily events." Not only does this view appear to be valid, for the reasons advanced by the speaker, but there are also factors that are peripheral to his central argument which lend it further authenticity.

The specifics of Savonarola's ideology had been in evidence, within the confines of the City of the Baptist, since the *Dugento*. Religious, political and social reformers from the age of Dante to that of the Fraticelli and St. Catherine of Siena, had drawn sustenance from the millenarian tradition that was pervasive throughout Tuscany. Stemming from the teachings of Joachim of Flora, this movement reached its apogee with the outbreaks of the War of the Eight Saints which was waged by the Florentines against the forces of the Holy See from 1375-1378. This era had much in common with the interval that was dominated by the spiritual and political dictatorship of Savonarola. Both were times of intense religious, economic and political experimentation.¹ Coluccio Salutati, the humanistic chancellor of the Florentine Republic, like his Dominican counterpart, envisioned the "divine election" of his beloved city as the champion of "*Libertà*" against the hosts of "avaricious Babylon." In his opinion, "*la chiesa carnale*" had to be destroyed and "*la terza chiesa spirituale*" elevated in its place. In this manner

would the City of the Red Lily fulfill its destiny, as it had been foretold by the followers of Joachim of Flora.² The motif of Florentine imperialism, civic liberty, and republicanism was evident in both periods.³ Promises of wealth, power, and national aggrandizement were also characteristic of these intervals.⁴ But despite these apparent similarities, there were fundamental differences that stemmed from basic mutations in the historical milieu that tended to give each period its individual character.

In the second half of the *Trecento*, men imbued with the messianic spirit were afforded the opportunity to preach their prophetic sermons under the ægis of the Florentine *Signoria* and there were those Fraticelli who used this occasion to reiterate their version of the teachings of Joachim of Flora. This permissive attitude, on the part of the government, represented a sharp reversal of communal policy. Until 1343, the republican regime had been characterized by its close cooperation with the inquisitorial arm of the church.⁵ In that year, motivated by practical considerations that hinged upon the breakdown of the Guelph alliance, the impending bankruptcy of many Florentine companies, and a political revolution, the *Signoria* took steps that were calculated to curtail the authority of the church within the confines of its territory.⁶ For the next three years the communal rectors were actively engaged in the enforcement of legislation that had been passed by the councils for the purpose of protecting the assets of the fallen companies from the precipitate claims of their ecclesiastical creditors.⁷ In order to accomplish this objective, the *Signoria* led an assault against the prerogatives of the inquisition and was not averse to harboring the enemies of that office. In this effort they were aided by the numerous *novi cives* who were admitted to political office at this time. Less mindful of the traditional immunities of the church than their socio-economic superiors, who had a virtual monopoly of important ecclesiastical benefices, the *gente nuova* were amenable to the new policies that were inaugurated by the *Signoria*.⁸

The needs of the urban patriciate appear to have been best served from 1343 to 1378 by the adoption of a political program that was predicated upon the taxation of the clergy, the destruction of the important clerical immunities, the restriction of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the pursuit of a foreign policy that was frequently antithetical to the interests of the Holy See.⁹ In the implementation of this program, public opinion was of considerable utility. In the past, when attacks had been leveled against traditionally venerated groups and individuals, the support of *il popolo minuto* was not a negligible factor.¹⁰ Now, in the second half of the *Trecento*, the *Signoria* looked again to the masses for approval.¹¹ This dependency was reinforced by the fact that there were

profound fissures within the ranks of the oligarchy. One leading faction of the patriciate was bitterly opposed to the measures that were being enacted against the traditional liberties of the church.¹² Their opponents, however, were more successful in their efforts, since they were able to win the favor of the lower orders. The presence of the Fraticelli within the confines of the city was not disadvantageous to the interests of this dominant faction.¹³

Between 1343 and 1382, the Spiritual Franciscans sought to diffuse their teachings among the populace. Unlike Savonarola, their pronouncements were directed toward the lower classes and reflected the needs and aspirations of these orders. In substance, their message was similar to that which was to be championed by the Dominican at the end of the *Quattrocento*. The decisive point of differentiation, however, appears to have stemmed from a radical shift in the composition of their audiences. The decline of the political influence of *il popolo minuto* in communal life after 1382 caused those who were imbued with the fervor of prophecy to direct their message toward the upper classes. Prior to this date, the urban patriciate had permitted the statute against heretics to fall into disuse and, in fact, this measure had become "*un ricordo storico*."¹⁴ By 1378 the *popolani grassi* had come to the realization that their latitudinarian policy had been based upon a political miscalculation.¹⁵ The masses, who referred to themselves as "*il popolo di Dio*," led by heretics and encouraged by the social gospel of the Fraticelli, overthrew the *Signoria* of their economic superiors and established the rule of the "*Ciampi*."¹⁶ In 1382, when the urban patriciate regained their authority over the state, one of the first measures that was enacted by the *Signoria* was directed against the Fraticelli.¹⁷ For the balance of the *Trecento*, this aristocratic regime cooperated closely with the inquisitorial arm of the church, and the decimation of the influence of the Fraticelli, among *il popolo minuto*, attests to the efficiency of this policy.¹⁸

Once again the writings of Coluccio Salutati reflect the intellectual currents of the late fourteenth century. During the war with the papacy, he utilized the ideology of the Fraticelli to further the interests of the Republic. But after 1382, this tendency is no longer discernible in his works.¹⁹ This trend is also manifested in the area of Florentine historiography. No longer are there anonymous chronicles in evidence that exhibit the Franciscan overtones of sympathy for the plight of *il popolo minuto*.²⁰ Time does not permit a detailed analysis of the contents of Florentine sermons during the early years of the *Quattrocento*. Suffice to say that their message is directed principally toward the upper classes. It would appear that the central argument of Professor Weinstein's paper is in accord with existing evidence concerning the addressees of

prophetic sermons that were given prior to the advent of Savonarola. If reforms were to be achieved, it was not to be as a result of appeals that were made to an impotent *popolo minuto*, but rather to an aggressive bourgeoisie.

Relations between church and state had been fraught with tension throughout the *Trecento*; the outcome of this struggle was to have a decisive influence upon the history of the subsequent era. By the beginning of the fifteenth century, communal authorities had succeeded in strengthening the jurisdiction of the state at the expense of the ecclesiastical tribunals.²¹ Communal taxation of clergy had been institutionalized as a regular feature of Florentine fiscal policy.²² In fact, the sharp antithesis that had existed between the *Signoria* and the Florentine church had lost most of its bitter edge and the rectors of the City of the Baptist had little reason to encourage further attacks by the Fraticelli against the immunities and privileges of the local clergy. During the century and a half that separated the founding of the priorate from the establishment of the Medicean *Signoria*, the Florentine church had lost many of its time-honored prerogatives and had become reconciled to a more subordinate role. Fra Giovanni Dominici and his renowned disciple, San Antonino, responded to these historical mutations by encouraging the faithful to be more mindful of their responsibilities toward secular society; while San Bernardino of Siena extolled the active civic life as opposed to that of contemplation.²³

Savonarola, like his immediate predecessors, had his ideological roots in the currents of Florentine civic life. Professor Weinstein has succeeded in translating this statement from the realm of the cliché to the plane of history. He depicts this prophetic leader as a man who was deeply concerned with the practical problems of his own times. The Dominican's interest in constitutional questions sharply differentiates him from his *Trecento* prototypes. His advice to the Florentine merchants that they lend money to the government at moderate rates of interest and his establishment of pawnshops for the poor, betrays a man who was profoundly immersed in the social and economic issues of his age. Because he was not extraneous to the forces of Florentine politics, his spoken word—with its humanistic sense of moral reconstruction—had a decisive impact upon his audience. When the Prior of San Marco promised civic liberty and empire to the citizenry, he revealed an identification with the aspirations of the aggressive and affluent *popolani grassi*. The compatibility of these interests lends credence to Professor Weinstein's argument: Savonarola was a *Quattrocento* prophet whose message was shaped by the press of daily events. It was his sensitivity to the changing historical milieu that distinguished him from his *Trecento* counterparts.

Finally, there remains the task of suggesting other facets of this problem that Professor Weinstein might explore. The identification of the anti-Medicean faction, and the part that they played in the politics of the period, stands as a challenging question. Similarly, the role of the *novi cives* may be decisive in explaining the rise of Savonarola, since these *gente nuova* had been in the vanguard of movements for church reform in the past. The part played by *il popolo minuto* is also vague. Most important, however, would be an inquiry into the mutations that the prophetic movement underwent during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. A study of this theme might serve to clarify the continuous and discontinuous elements that bind or separate the centuries from 1300 to 1500.

1. For cultural manifestations, see Milard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena After the Black Death* (Princeton, 1947), pp. 80-93; F. Antal, *Florentine Painting and its Social Background* (London, 1947), pp. 71-72; N. Sapegno, *Storia letteraria d'Italia, il Trecento* (Milan, 1934), pp. 528-540; A. Panella, "La guerra degli Otto Santi le vicende delle legge contro i vescovi," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, I (1941), pp. 36-45; M. Becker, "Three Cases Concerning the Restitution of Usury in Florence," *Journal of Economic History* (1957), pp. 446-447.
2. E. Garin, *L'Umanesimo italiano* (Bari, 1952), pp. 38 ff.; N. Valeri, *L'Italia nell'età dei principati dal 1343 al 1516* (Milan, 1949), p. 206.
3. The displacement of both factions from Florentine political life in 1372, led to an intensification of the power of the state as opposed to the authority of the church. The heightened sense of civic consciousness that evolved parallels that which developed upon the ouster of the Medici in 1494. Cf. especially the minutes of the sessions of the advisory councils in *Consulte et Pratiche*, vols. 12-15. (All documents cited are to be found in the *Archivio di Stato* in Florence).
4. Cf. H. Grundmann, "Die papst-prophetien des mittelalters," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XIX (1928), p. 122; G. Brucker, "Un documento fiorentino sulla guerra, sulla finanza e sulla amministrazione pubblica (1375)," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, II (1957), pp. 165-176.
5. The *Signoria* was solicitous in its attitude toward the inquisition and appointed communal syndics to aid the inquisitor in the performance of his functions. Cf. *Provisioni*, 16, f. 20r; *ibid.*, 28, f. 8r; *Libri Fabarum*, 16, I, f. 102.
6. One of the principal motives that animated the passage of these measures was the desire of the *Signoria* to prevent victims of usurious contracts from making appeals to ecclesiastical courts. Cf. G. Villani, *Cronica*, ed. F. Dragomani (Florence, 1844), XII, 44; N. Rodolico, *I Ciompi* (Florence, 1945), p. 42.
7. Pepo Frescobaldi, a member of the famous aristocratic banking family, was one of the spokesmen for the legislation in question. Cf. *Provisioni Duplicati*, 5, f. 54.
8. For a consideration of the problem of representation, see G. Brucker and M. Becker, "The *Arti Minori* in Florentine Politics, 1342-1378," *Medieval Studies*, XVIII (1956), pp. 96-97.
9. For a detailed analysis of this problem, see A. Saporì, *La crisi delle compagnie mercantili dei Bardi e dei Peruzzi* (Florence, 1926), pp. 117 ff. For a consideration of the pragmatic nature of the Republic's foreign policy, see N. Rubinstein, "Florence and the Despots: Some aspects of Florentine Diplomacy in the Fourteenth Century," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series (1952), vol. 2, pp. 21-45.
10. Cf. G. Salvemini, *Magnati e popolani in Firenze dal 1280 al 1295* (Florence, 1899), p. 60; Paulino Pieri, *Cronica delle cose d'Italia*, ed. A. Adami (Rome, 1755), pp. 56-58; N. Ottokar, *Il comune di Firenze alla fine del dugento* (Florence, 1926), pp. 286-289.
11. According to the testimony of the chronicler Donato Velluti, during his tenure as *Gonfaloniere di Giustizia*, both factions vied for the favor of the lower orders. Cf. his *Cronica domestica*, eds. I. del Lungo and G. Volpe (Florence, 1914), pp. 240.
12. For the role of this group in communal politics, see A. Rado, *Maso degli Albizzi e il parte oligarchia, 1382-1393* (Florence, 1926), pp. 40-45.

SAVONAROLA, FLORENCE, THE MILLENNARIAN TRADITION 311

13. This was especially true during the era of war with the papacy (1375-78). Cf. A. Gherardi, "La guerra dei Fiorentini con papa Gregorio XI," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, V, VIII (1867-1868).
14. F. Tocco, *Studi francescani* (Naples, 1909), p. 414.
15. For the part that the diffusion of the teachings played in precipitating the revolt of the masses in that year, see N. Rodolico, *La democrazia fiorentina nel suo tramonto* (1378-1382), (Bologna, 1905), p. 62 ff.
16. For the influence of heretics on the revolutionaries, see A. Saponi, *Compagnie e mercanti di Firenze antica* (Florence, 1955), p. LXXXVI; M. A. Gukowski, "Chi fu a capo della sommosa dei Ciompi?" *Studi in Onore di Armando Saponi* (Milan, 1957), pp. 710-713. It should also be noted that members of the patriciate cooperated with the regime of the *minuti* and *minori* and assumed communal office. There were individuals from the Acciaiuoli, Antella, Bardi, Bondelmonti, Medici, Pazzi, Peruzzi and other eminent Florentine families.
17. *Provisioni*, 71, fols. 175r-176r (13 December 1382). The Spirituals had considerable support in the legislative councils. On the preceding day, the measure "contra fraticellos" had been rejected. (*Libri Fabarum*, 41, f. 77). It barely managed to secure the required two-thirds majority. The votes in the two councils were 179-81 and 104-52.
18. *Consulte et Pratiche*, 25, f. 56r (9 April 1386); *idem*, 26, f. 182 (18 March 1388).
19. Hans Baron, "Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanism," *Speculum*, XIII (1938), p. 16.
20. For a review of this type of historiography, see N. Rodolico, *I Ciompi*, pp. VII-XVI.
21. This was true especially in cases involving a charge of usury. *Statuti Populi Communis Florentiae* (Freiburg, 1715), bk. II, rub. 18, pp. 123-124. In 1435 the Medicean Signoria suspended the law against dry exchange. *Provisioni*, 126, fols. 313r-314; *Libri Fabarum*, f. 42.
22. See the evaluation of the landed patrimony of the clergy that the comune made for the purpose of tax assessment in G. Canestrini's, *La scienza e l'arte di stato dagli atti ufficiali della repubblica fiorentina e dei Medici* (Florence, 1862), p. 152.
23. E. Garin, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-53.



**A magnificent new series by one of the
greatest church historians of our time**

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE'S



Christianity in a Revolutionary Age

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES

Volume I

The Nineteenth Century in Europe

BACKGROUND AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PHASE

"I know of no comparable project aimed at presenting in scholarly and objective fashion a detailed, comprehensive history of modern Christianity in its major divisions. The first installment is a fine achievement in itself and a happy harbinger of volumes yet to come. . . . It is informative and illuminating, and at the same time a major contribution to mutual understanding."—CARLTON J. H. HAYES

At your bookseller \$6.00

HARPER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 16

THE DIPLOMATIC ROLE OF GASPARO CARDINAL CONTARINI AT THE COLLOQUY OF RATISBON OF 1541

HEINZ MACKENSEN, *Fairleigh Dickinson University*

The greatest possibility for establishing concord between Protestantism and Rome during the Reformation occurred during the colloquy of Ratisbon of 1541. Along with Charles V one of the chief actors in the attempt to bring about such a concord at the diet and its accompanying theological colloquy was Cardinal Contarini. He had been appointed papal legate by Paul III. Although Contarini's theological position on the question of justification was of crucial importance, the conflicting political forces represented at Ratisbon also helped to delineate the role he played there and its tragic denouement. In fact religious and political interests were so interwoven at Ratisbon that it is often hard to tell which came first. Whichever interests came first at any particular point, Contarini was, however, well equipped to deal with them, for he was both an experienced diplomat and a learned theologian.

Contarini's theological role at Ratisbon was of such importance that it deserves a separate detailed examination.¹ The aim of this study is, therefore, principally to consider Contarini's role as a diplomat at Ratisbon. How exactly did he, as papal legate, meet and deal with the different conflicting forces active there? How did these forces seek to influence him? How did Contarini succeed or fail in mastering or guiding these forces so that the interests of his master, Paul III, were served? The answers to these questions will also present an excellent background for understanding Contarini's theological role at Ratisbon.

Contarini, the scion of an ancient Venetian noble family, had studied at Padua and after some early vacillations whether or not to embrace a religious life, had entered the diplomatic service of his native state. After serving brilliantly as Venetian ambassador to Charles V and to the pope, he returned to Venice and rose through the different offices until finally he attained membership in the *Signoria*. He had remained a layman and a bachelor and had continued amid his diplomatic and political duties to cultivate theological studies. His inner life, which sprang from a religious experience in 1511 very much like Luther's, had also grown deeper and richer through the years. Nevertheless his appointment by Paul III to the Sacred College in 1535 came as a complete surprise to Contarini. Paul III proposed to use Contarini as the head of a "Reform" group at his court.² As a cardinal in Rome Contarini soon became known as one of the heads, along with Sadolet,

Reginald Pole and Fregoso, of the "Reform" party. His zeal for reform, especially of the curial bureaux, led to the widely repeated remark, "This Venetian wishes to reform the Sacred College without knowing the names of the cardinals."³ Paul III, however, favored Contarini and encouraged him to speak out in the frankest manner in consistories and meetings. In 1537 Contarini, together with Caraffa, Sadolet, Pole and others, prepared for the pope the famous *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*.⁴ In language that is generally conceded to be chiefly Contarini's, the abuses and evils prevalent in the church are described and condemned in the sharpest terms and thorough reforms are strongly recommended. This was followed in later years by treatises on the power of the keys and on the power of the pope.⁵ In his constant efforts to reform and strengthen the church Contarini was ready to help anyone working for the same ends.⁶ Thus he befriended a certain crippled former Spanish army officer, copied down his *Spiritual Exercises* with his own hand, and mediated in 1540 the Spaniard's request to Paul III that the small *Compañia* of soldiers of Jesus he had gathered be organized under a constitution.⁷ Contarini's greatest opportunity to work in the direction of reform and conciliation in the titanic religious upheavals of his day seemed to him, however, to have come in the year 1541.

In seeking to unravel the skeins that led to the calling of the diet and the colloquy of Ratisbon of 1541 the historian is struck by their multiplicity and variety. The oft-repeated statement that, before the chasm between the opposing parties became final, one last attempt at reunion had to be made, seems inadequate to characterize fully the forces which, by design or accident, came together at Regensburg to create the optimum situation for a reunion by way of concord. What were these forces? In order to unravel the skeins somewhat, the first distinction, after the obvious one, is that between the forces on each side chiefly influenced by theological considerations and those influenced chiefly by political factors. It is not possible to make black and white distinctions here, especially in an age which knew nothing of separation of church and state. Every actor in the drama seems to have been affected by both religious and political considerations to some extent, but the scope and intensity of these varied from one extreme to the other. A Melanchthon seemed to live in a world in which there were practically no political considerations. A Granvelle hardly knew anything else. If the attempt is made to classify the various forces which came to bear upon Contarini at Ratisbon it may perhaps best be done by a list which reveals the political groups and their theological allies

or representatives. Such an attempt might produce a list as follows:

CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT	
Political	Theological	Political	
France and Bavaria	Eck Melancthon	Saxony	
Charles V (Granvelle)	Gropper Butzer	Hesse and Brandenburg	
Paul III (Farnese)	Contarini		

In a consistory on January 10, 1541 (O.S.) Contarini was created by Paul III *legatus a latere* for Germany.⁸ Being the man of order and affairs that he was, Contarini respectfully requested the pope through Cardinal Santa Croce (Cervini) for the correspondence and documents relative to the impending imperial diet and for instructions for the legation.⁹ He did not have long to wait for his answer. On January 28, 1541 (O.S.) he received a long and carefully worded set of instructions for his German legation.¹⁰ The directions given the new legate in this document stem undoubtedly from Paul III's mind, but the style and arrangement seem to reveal the fine hand of Alexander Cardinal Farnese. This intelligent, capable and rather self-centered young man had, by 1541, been named by Paul III "vice-chancellor of the church" and was generally viewed as the pontiff's personal lieutenant in the Sacred College.¹¹ He had perhaps hopes of succeeding his grandfather in the highest post. Cardinal Farnese was to be the man to whom Contarini was to report events at Ratisbon in daily reports.¹² The instructions given Contarini directed him to inform Charles V that the pope cared for nothing more greatly than that the unhappy division of Germany should be ended and that country restored to unity once again, especially since the pope saw no other nation in Christendom which could dispose of greater strength in war against the infidels.¹³ As to religious demands made by the Protestants, the pope insisted he could almost divine that such demands would be of a character that he could not, nor much less could any of his legates, agree to them without great scandal and danger to souls.¹⁴ However, should the Germans succeed in agreeing amongst themselves upon articles in harmony with the faith in spiritual, and with justice in temporal, matters, then the remaining articles upon which they still differed might best be submitted to him, as to a good shepherd. He would take care that such remaining matters be decided by a general council or "in other equivalent manner."¹⁵ Adducing such arguments Contarini was to explain to Charles V why the pope had not given Contarini the very broad powers which the emperor had asked for him. The legate was further to urge peace with Francis I of France upon the emperor, but if Charles could not promise this, then let him at least permit nothing against God's honor

or the pope's authority to occur at the diet. If this should happen the legate was to quit the court and entourage of the emperor. The calling of a German national council was to be opposed by Contarini in every way. Towards the end of his instructions Paul III then included a very interesting passage which reveals how well he understood Contarini's conciliatory and irenic personality. It would never be displeasing to the pontiff, he insisted, if the legate acted towards the Protestant theologians in a kindly and friendly manner, if this could be done without harm or injury to the faith. However, since the Lutherans were very wily, one might fear lest Contarini's acts or statements done in good will be misused by them for purposes of subversion, wherefore prudence on the part of the cardinal-legate and of his *familia* should be carefully observed. As a further reinforcement Contarini, besides a number of companions including the *magister sacri palatii*, was to have as collaborator the papal ambassador or *nuntius* to Charles V, Giovanni de Morone, bishop of Modena.¹⁸

After long delays in the arrival of princes, bishops and delegates, the sessions of the diet finally began with a mass of the Holy Ghost on April 6th. Upon the basis of the imperial proposition a religious colloquy was then organized and began its meetings on April 27th.¹⁸ The two presidents of this theological debating society were to be Granvelle and the prince-palatinate. The collocutors were, for the Catholic side, Eck, Gropper and Julius von Pflug, and for the Protestant side, Melancthon, Butzer and Pistorius. A group of "witnesses" also attended the meetings. The discussion centered about a book presented by Granvelle to the collocutors with the comment that it had been compiled by a group of Belgian theologians now deceased. This was the famous "Regensburg Book."¹⁹ Actually it was the work of Gropper, Butzer and a certain Gerhard Veltwyck.²⁰ In a series of twenty-three articles, principal points of theology were set forth in a manner as conciliatory to both sides as possible. When Contarini first saw the book he noted about twenty changes as necessary in order to eliminate errors. He further added the term *transubstantiatio* in the margin of the article dealing with the eucharist. The Catholic collocutors met Contarini each morning and he discussed with them the questions being currently considered.²¹ Even with Eck's participation the collocutors, after some changes of the text, agreed upon the first four articles of the book (on the creation of man and his state before the fall, on free will, on the cause of sin, and on original sin). The fifth article dealt with man's justification. As was to be expected this article led to long debate and

great differences of opinion, but an article was finally developed which all the collocutors (Eck included), and Contarini as well, accepted. This success was, however, the beginning of the end. Luther in Wittenberg and the pope in Rome refused to accept this article. The collocutors ran into ever greater difficulties in the later articles dealing with hierarchy and ceremony. They finally simply passed from one to the next without reaching any agreement. The colloquy came to an end on May 29th, having thus lasted about a month.²² The diet continued, however, until July 29th.²³

THE EMPEROR AND GROPPER

This simple account of the diet and colloquy of Ratisbon provides merely a skeleton. As has been shown, Contarini was well acquainted with Charles V.²⁴ The emperor had made great efforts to bring about Contarini's appointment as legate and expected the greatest help from him for the imperial policy of concord. Charles believed that this policy could yet succeed. For years he and his advisors had prepared for such an optimum situation for concord as now appeared in the making at Ratisbon. If this policy should end in failure after such a supreme effort, this failure would shake the emperor to the core. His course for many years would be proven false and only force would remain as the alternative.²⁵ Contarini, although wishing to foster the imperial policy of concord, which was also his own personal policy, nevertheless opposed firmly concessions which would inevitably injure the authority of the church as the final arbiter of doctrine. When all was said and done, councils and popes remained for Contarini the ultimate court of appeal despite the fact that his own inner religious life had grown from an experience very like Luther's in 1511.

Upon the legate's first audience with the emperor in Ratisbon he was met at the foot of the staircase by Charles and greeted "most amiably and devoutly."²⁶ This visit was returned by Granvelle, the emperor's chief advisor and successor of Gattinara, several days later.²⁷ This clever diplomat sought to make quite sure of Contarini's full support for the imperial policy of concord.²⁸ He pictured the Lutheran leaders as being most desirous of concord because they saw the new doctrines creating lawlessness and disobedience in their states. They were willing to agree, Granvelle insisted to Contarini, but they could agree with better grace with someone like the legate than with someone like Eck. The imperial minister then sought to sound out the papal legate on doctrinal matters. He suggested that since the Lutherans rejected the term "transubstantiation" it might be wise to leave this mat-

ter to a general council and not to mention the matter at all. Granvelle had clearly known Contarini only as a diplomat and probably could not even imagine, since they were so foreign to himself, the deep undercurrents of mystical piety and religious conviction that gave meaning to the legate's life. The cardinal answered so strongly that "His Lordship remained silent and made me no reply."²⁹ When Granvelle objected that the matter involved was expressed only by a single word, Contarini answered that one single word (*filiouque*) had led to the Greek schism.³⁰ Upon the legate's asking what the Protestants thought of the primacy of the pope, Granvelle insisted that they would return to obedience of the bishops and the bishops would obey the pope. In short Granvelle thought to manipulate and arrange matters of faith as he did matters of state.³¹ Even though Contarini was also a diplomat, his theological position was so clear and firm that he insisted even before the beginning of the colloquy upon doctrines of a sacramental and hierarchical character whose non-acceptance by the Protestants led ultimately, despite all the optimism and success of the intervening weeks, to the final failure of the colloquy. But Granvelle was soon to discover that Contarini would cause still other difficulties. When Granvelle's son, the bishop of Arras, brought the legate a copy of the emperor's *propositio*, which was to be presented to the diet, the legate protested that he was not mentioned therein.³² He (Contarini) did not mind not being mentioned but the pope would. When told this could not be changed, Contarini went to see the emperor. One can see that the Venetian was not remiss in watching over the interests of his master, as has sometimes been maintained. Charles soothed him by saying the Protestants were like proud animals which must be domesticated little by little until ready for the bridle.³³ In meetings with the emperor during the next few days Charles insisted that "our dissensions are the Turk's strength."³⁴ Contarini, taking advantage of such an occasion, asked Charles his opinion as to the possibilities for a successful concord. The emperor replied "It is not I who have been lacking. I have done what I should and more than I should. But others have not shown good will nor do they wish a fraternal concord." The emperor then went on to indicate that he was thinking especially of the Bavarians.³⁵ Contarini then stated that Christendom could hear no better news, i.e. than that the emperor wished for concord. His Majesty, however, replied "God will do it."³⁶ One can still hear, despite all the emperor's plans and moves towards concord, especially at Ratisbon, that undertone of resignation in God's will which led him ultimately to the retreat of St. Just.

Granvelle, however, did not weary in seeking to attain the goal which he had failed to reach in his first interview with Contarini. On May 11th when the colloquy had been proceeding with some success for several weeks, when several articles had been agreed upon, and when the term *transubstantiatio* became a stumbling block, the imperial minister tried once again to get the legate to yield on this point, but the latter's answer was as firm as before.³⁷ In fact the cardinal sought an audience with the emperor three days later and again denounced any attempt at a concord if the Protestants did not depart from their views on the eucharist.³⁸ Charles replied that Granvelle had informed him the matter involved only a single word. It seemed best to the emperor to continue the colloquy as long as possible in order to gain as much as possible from the adversaries. It was always a simple matter to break off negotiations, he insisted, and implied that it was not so easy to open them again. Contarini answered that he certainly was not seeking to end the negotiations but wished, as did his master, the concord of the German nation. Nevertheless one single word could have the greatest significance. The legate reminded the emperor of the council of Nicaea at which one single word (*homousios*) had become the dividing line.³⁹ Hereupon Charles changed the subject and spoke of the city of Buda, now a field of battle with the Turks, and of his hopes for relieving his troops. A growing dissatisfaction on the part of the emperor with his friend of many years' standing seems to begin at this point.

By the beginning of June the colloquy had ended and had failed of its purposes and, according to Contarini, the emperor and Granvelle were frantically seeking an honorable exit out of the labyrinth in which they were immersed.⁴⁰ They finally hit upon the scheme which was announced in the imperial recess at the close of the diet. According to this both parties were to adhere to those articles of the Regensburg Book to which they had both agreed (the first five articles) until an ecumenical or national council or another imperial diet attended by a papal legate would be held.⁴¹ During the month of June the emperor and Granvelle had made a last attempt to cooperate with Contarini by having meetings between their theologians, including two Spaniards and a Burgundian, and Contarini and his advisers.⁴² Contarini informed the emperor of the progress of these conferences among the Catholic theologians in an audience on June 19th. By this time the legate had become so thoroughly disillusioned of any hopes for concord with the Protestants that he urgently advised the emperor to come to terms with the Catholic league of princes and bishops (Bavaria,

Mainz, etc.), but Charles would not do this. He insisted that they might draw him into a war he did not want.⁴³ In another audience with the emperor a month later, as the diet was coming to a close, Contarini protested against the emperor's not mentioning the pope in connection with the general council which he had mentioned in the recess.⁴⁴ Charles insisted, however, that in mentioning a general council he had implicitly included the pope who would be the head of any such council.⁴⁵ It was, however, the emperor's inclusion of the possibility of a German national council in the recess that led to an estrangement with the legate. The emperor had promised Contarini that he would not mention the possibility of a national council at the close of the diet. Contarini discovered, although the document was kept from him while it was being prepared, that there was to be a reference to such a council in the recess. The legate succeeded in outflanking the emperor by having the cardinal-archbishop-elect of Mainz, in his capacity as archchancellor of the Empire, inform the diet before publication of the recess that no national council could decide finally in matters pertaining to the universal church.⁴⁶ In his next interview with Contarini Charles excused himself by saying a wise man had to adapt his plans to the circumstances. That a break and alienation in the friendly relationship of many years between the emperor and the Venetian had taken place was obvious to both.

*

*

*

Since Charles and Granvelle were seeking to achieve a conciliation with the Protestants for chiefly political reasons, it is not surprising that they should support theologians who were also conciliatory in their theology, and should choose such men to do their work for them in the colloquy. John Gropper of Cologne had been the chief author of the Regensburg Book.⁴⁷ The emperor included him among the three Catholic collocutors and he worked closely with Contarini during the colloquy. The two seemed to be quite similar in personality and got along very well. Gropper had studied theology at Cologne under Albert Pighhe (Pighius), theology professor there since 1517, who had sought to meet the great doctrinal issues of the day in an irenic manner. Pighhe sought to reconcile the claims of both parties by teaching the doctrine of a double justification sometimes called *Semilutheranismus*.⁴⁸ One justification, according to him, flowed from the righteousness of Christ, which was imputed to the believer by and through faith. The other justification sprang from seeds of righteousness inherent in

man, which were impaired, feeble and insufficient, but which could be repaired and augmented by grace. Pigghe insisted, however, that the former was the primary and decisive justification.⁴⁹ Gropper had also set forth these doctrines as early as 1536 in his *Enchiridion*.⁵⁰ It must further be kept in mind that Gropper was in the service of Hermann von Wied, the archbishop-elect of Cologne.⁵¹ When, however, that elector sought to introduce Protestantism into his lands shortly after the Ratisbon Colloquy, Gropper was to become his chief opponent.⁵² As early as December 1540 at the colloquy of Worms, Gropper had met secretly at the orders of his archbishop with Martin Butzer, who had received similar instructions from Philip of Hesse. Along with the imperial counselor, convert from Judaism and Talmudic scholar, Gerhard Veltwyck,⁵³ they had then prepared the Regensburg Book, which was presented by Granvelle to the collocutors as the work of learned and deceased men in Belgium.⁵⁴ Both Contarini and Eck decided separately and unknown to each other, from observing how quickly and with what facility Gropper agreed to making changes in the text during the first meeting of the Catholic collocutors, that Gropper must be the real author of the book.⁵⁵ Close study of Contarini's and Gropper's theological views disproves the theory advanced by Döllinger and others that Contarini obtained his theory of double justification from Gropper and Pigghe at Ratisbon. Especially the letters of the young Contarini during the formative years of his religious development (recently discovered and published by Jedin) prove conclusively that Contarini did not make his own Gropper's and Pigghe's doctrine of double justification (*Semilutheranismus*), but that the doctrine on justification set forth by Contarini in his *Epistle* had developed out of his own youthful religious experience in Venice in 1511.⁵⁶

Contarini found in Gropper a man very much like himself. As early as May 3rd the legate reported most favorably to Cardinal Farnese about Gropper and suggested the pope give him some present.⁵⁷ Morone reported that Gropper was showing much zeal for concord and great learning.⁵⁸ Ten days later, however, when the term *transubstantiatio* became an issue Contarini stood firm although Gropper was willing to yield.⁵⁹ By the time the diet was nearing its end and nerves were becoming frayed and tempers sharpened, the tension between Gropper and Eck had reached the breaking point, so that Contarini had to step in to conciliate the theologian of conciliation with good words and a promise of 200 *scudi*,⁶⁰ which were presented to the Cologne theologian before Contarini left Ratisbon.⁶¹

FRANCE, BAVARIA AND ECK

The Catholic power that viewed the possibility of religious concord in Germany with the greatest alarm was France.⁶² The duel between Francis I and Charles V, carried on through four wars, made the former only too conscious of the weakening effect of religious developments upon the power of the latter. The French sought to hamper Contarini in every way and made a flank attack upon him at the Vatican by spreading the rumor that the cardinal was much too obsequious towards the emperor.⁶³ The French king further maintained two emissaries at Ratisbon,—one to the Catholics and the other to the Protestants. Both argued against concord with every possible argument.⁶⁴ In dealing with the French Contarini was hampered by the fact that he had very little contact with them and had been so long associated with France's worst enemy. Contarini nevertheless tried to ward off French attacks upon him and to reassure the French as to his impartiality as papal legate as best he could. For this end he made use of the fact that his brother-in-law, Matteo Dandolo, was at this time Venetian ambassador to the king of France. Contarini also attempted to reassure the French by means of letters to the papal *nuncio* at the French court, Hieronimo Dandino.⁶⁵ Feeling perhaps that at times nothing gains good will more quickly than a request for a favor, Contarini tried to obtain, through the Cardinal of Ferrara, Francis I's influence with the Turks in the restitution of the property of his (Contarini's) brother Angelo, who had lived for twenty-three years under the Turks and was therefore no longer an alien under their law.⁶⁶ In further letters Contarini sought to keep Francis mollified. However, in a letter of May 17th, written by the cardinal of Mantua, the French king let Contarini know that he had received reports from Ratisbon that the legate was much too mild towards the Protestants. The Most Christian King expressed the wish that Contarini should represent the interests of the Catholic faith and of the Holy See more strongly and that he should keep the king informed through the French envoy in Ratisbon.⁶⁷ Contarini defended himself through a letter to the papal *nuncio* in France.⁶⁸ He reported to him a meeting with the French ambassador in Ratisbon in which the legate had protested strongly against the insinuation made by the French king that he had agreed to heretical opinions contained in the agreed upon articles.⁶⁹ Realizing that such a claim had probably reached France by way of Bavaria (Eck), Contarini sought to defend himself by a rearguard action. To do this he utilized his contacts in the Venetian diplomatic corps and wrote to his brother-in-law, the Venetian

ambassador to France.⁷⁰ Writing at some length and quite convincingly, he rejected once more the French claims.⁷¹

Among the German states and in the imperial diet it was especially Bavaria, assisted by the elector of Mainz and the other bishops and abbots, as well as by such princes as Henry, duke of Brunswick, who tried to block any concord and who cooperated with France. Morone, the papal *nuncio* to Charles, insisted to Contarini that the Bavarian dukes were Catholic not because of any zeal for the faith, but in order that they might be heads of their camps and increase their powers. Shortly after Contarini's arrival in Ratisbon, three counselors of the Bavarian dukes came to see him.⁷² They attributed the increase in the numbers of the Lutherans to the negligence and leniency of the emperor.⁷³ They suggested that a colloquy could have no real results, a general council to settle the issues was not possible now, and thus only the use of force remained. This policy could best be followed by strengthening the league of Catholic states.⁷⁴ Contarini put the Bavarians off for the present with diplomatic words but informed Farnese that he could always make use of them if the emperor sought to enter upon ways that were not good.⁷⁵ On March 26th Contarini's brother Francesco, who was also in Ratisbon in his capacity as Venetian ambassador to the emperor, received a suggestion from Duke Ludwig of Bavaria that he urge his brother the cardinal to speak up more strongly in defense of religion. Francesco defended his brother vigorously and said that even if Justinian were present he would not be a better defender of the faith than Gasparo.⁷⁶ Several days later, on March 29th, the three Bavarian counselors again visited the legate and insisted the colloquy was a bad thing. Force would be much better. This time the legate came out for the colloquy but insisted he would never recede an inch from the truth. In his dispatch to Farnese Contarini then characterized the Bavarian dukes as jealous of the position of leadership of Philip of Hesse and seeking a similar one for themselves among the Catholic states. Even though they had not a penny to their name, the Bavarian dukes wished to make war with the monies of His Holiness and of the German clergy.⁷⁷ At the end of April, Morone again reported to Farnese the continuing distrust of Contarini on the part of the Bavarians.⁷⁸ By the middle of June, as the dissatisfaction of the emperor with Contarini grew because of his increasing intransigence on doctrinal matters, Contarini began to draw closer to the Bavarians and informed them of the contents of his conversation with the emperor about the league.⁷⁹ Charles seems too at this time to

have begun to consider the adoption of a policy of force in dealing with the Protestants.⁸⁰ Did Contarini now begin to lean in this direction only because of this development or also because of the greater insight he had gained into the irreconcilable religious differences separating the parties? On June 23rd Farnese, in a letter to Contarini, complimented the Bavarians on their zeal.⁸¹ By the time the diet was ending the Bavarian dukes presented Contarini with a thirty-page plan for a new league.⁸² Contarini continued, however, to believe that the rumors which accused him of having agreed to heretical doctrines in the agreed upon articles had their source in Bavaria.⁸³

*

*

*

The theological representative of Bavaria at the colloquy was the redoubtable Doctor Johann Eck (originally Meyer) of Ingolstadt, a man who delighted in the role of the bluff and hearty old scholastic conservative and who had shrewdness, toughness, and a sense of humor as typically German as Luther's.⁸⁴ He was, in short, a hard boiled egg-head. He was very jealous of his role as the then outstanding defender of the old faith in Germany. On April 1st, concerned that he had not yet been invited to Ratisbon, Eck wrote Cardinal Farnese of his regrets about this. He felt certain he would make the Protestants gentler in Ratisbon, as he had already done at the colloquy of Worms at the beginning of the year.⁸⁵ By April 18th Eck was in Ratisbon and Contarini insisted in a conference with Granvelle that he be included among the Catholic collocutors.⁸⁶ Why did the mild and reasonable Contarini insist upon a man of such different and difficult personality and temperament? He undoubtedly realized that any concord attained without Eck's participation would be open to continual attacks from him and his party. Were the doctor of Ingolstadt to participate and possibly to approve, much would be gained.⁸⁷ The same could be said for Melancthon. By giving the two decided men, Eck and Melancthon, four irenically minded collocutors, two from each side, they would always be in a minority and the goal of concord would best be served.⁸⁸ Could Contarini bring this about? At first the pessimists seemed to be right. No sooner had Eck seen the Regensburg Book than he began to attack it vehemently. On April 27th he gave Contarini a list of the errors he had found it to contain.⁸⁹ Contarini noticed they were mostly of a philosophical nature and he felt that Eck erred rather more than the book. In a private conversation with Contarini Eck pointed out that in the book the statement was made "that God was

the effective (primary) cause of our salvation and Christ was the subsequent cause."⁹⁰ This seemed to him to smack of Arianism. Contarini insisted, however, that this text should be understood of Christ's human nature, which the Damascene and other fathers had called "God's primary tool,"⁹¹ wherefore this nature might also be called "the subsequent cause." This quieted Eck.⁹² In the daily early morning conferences between Contarini and the Catholic collocutors, Contarini managed to lead Eck ever further along the road of cooperation.⁹³ Melancthon noticed the change in Eck's manner and commented on it but was not able to discover what was causing it. On May 2nd Eck even agreed, although with hesitation, to the fifth article which dealt with justification.⁹⁴ On May 13th, as the spirit of agreement vanished steadily from the colloquy under the impact of the debate on the eucharist and on the later articles, Eck fell ill of a fever of which he was still suffering ten days later.⁹⁵ Contarini praised Eck in dispatches to Farnese and as the colloquy approached its end he intervened successfully with Cervini in order to facilitate Eck's finally receiving a canonry in Ratisbon, which he had long been granted but which had been contested by an Italian.⁹⁶ In the *Apologia* issued by Eck with regard to the colloquy of Ratisbon he strongly defended Contarini's policy at Ratisbon as well as his character. He felt that Contarini had been misled by his kindly and gentle disposition to expect too much from Butzer and his associates.⁹⁷

HESSE, BRANDENBURG AND BUTZER

The difficulties which began to plague Philip of Hesse because of his bigamy made him more conciliatory. They had become so serious by the time of the colloquy of Worms (December 1540-January 1541) that Philip had had secret conferences with Granvelle, who seems to have made the first move in arranging them.⁹⁸ From these conferences had grown the meetings and discussions between Butzer, Gropper and Veltwyck that had produced the Regensburg Book.⁹⁹ Philip then sent it to the elector of Brandenburg. Towards the beginning of the colloquy the landgrave was heard to state that the church needed a head like any other body and sent his band to serenade Contarini.¹⁰⁰ Philip supported the Protestant theologian who was the outstanding exponent of concord,—Martin Butzer.¹⁰¹ Butzer was in many ways similar to Gropper in the Catholic camp. It is therefore not surprising that the beginnings of friendlier relations between Contarini and Butzer should have been established at Ratisbon and should have culminated in a

personal interview. With the failure of the attempts at concord this relationship could naturally not continue. In his irenic policy Butzer was supported by the Brandenburg elector, Joachim II. As soon as Joachim had arrived in Ratisbon he had expressed a wish to accompany the emperor to mass. Contarini urged Charles to accept this offer and win the elector by kindness.¹⁰² The emperor accepted and Joachim participated fully in the ceremonial.¹⁰³ On May 20th he visited his uncle, the archbishop-elect of Mainz, and informed Contarini on June 24th that he intended to write the pope a letter on a private matter.¹⁰⁴ These conciliatory maneuvers by Philip of Hesse and Joachim of Brandenburg in the diplomatic field were accompanied by the work for concord in the theological field of Martin Butzer. During the colloquy of Hagenau, or at latest during the colloquy of Worms, Butzer had begun to meet Gropper or Gropper Butzer, according to which version of their meetings one wishes to accept, for each later accused the other of having made the first move.¹⁰⁵ During the colloquy Butzer also paid Contarini a personal visit and addressed him in words which have the ring of sincerity about them.¹⁰⁶ In this meeting between the legate and the German theologian, those were thus represented in both camps who still believed that a complete and permanent break could be avoided. Butzer fought for this goal with great energy throughout the colloquy.¹⁰⁷ Morone reported to Farnese on May 3rd that Butzer was doing excellent work for the concord, and on May 11th at the height of the controversy about inclusion or exclusion of the term *transubstantiatio* in the article on the eucharist, that Granvelle had informed him that Butzer had offered to use that term himself in preaching in two months' time if it were possible to establish a concord now without using the term.¹⁰⁸ This is, of course, merely Granvelle's statement. Butzer later insisted that Contarini had privately approved the Regensburg Book but had not dared to do this publicly.¹⁰⁹ The legate, according to Butzer, was a man most worthy of respect because of his age, piety, learning and character, but he had finally subordinated everything else to the demands of the position which the pope had imposed upon him.¹¹⁰

SAXONY AND MELANCHTHON

If Philip of Hesse followed a policy of seeking to gain the emperor's favor, the elector John Frederick of Saxony, the head of the Schmalkaldic League, sought as much as lay in his power to frustrate Charles V in his every design. During a conversation with Contarini before the beginning of the diet on March 20th, the emperor had insisted that

the Saxon elector would attend.¹¹¹ Did Charles really believe this or was he seeking to strengthen the legate's early optimism about the possibilities of concord? Actually John Frederick had not the slightest intention of attending. Instead he instructed the counselors who were to represent him at the diet to tell Philip of Hesse that he could not come to the diet but felt that the discussions begun at Worms should continue lest the blame for their failure fall upon the Protestants.¹¹² He would continue to adhere to the Augsburg Confession and knew Philip would do the same.¹¹³ The presence of the pope's legate at the diet would be of no significance, the elector instructed his *Räte*, unless he sought to exert authority in religious matters. In such a case the counselors were to protest against the legate's actions, even if the landgrave would not join in such protest.¹¹⁴ In general if the emperor were to weary of long protracted religious debates and could not tarry at Ratisbon, he might be willing to agree to a permanent civil peace leaving religious matters completely as they were. This would be the best possible solution since the Papists would never accept God's Word anyway.¹¹⁵ The counselors were to keep an eye on the landgrave and keep the elector informed in code.¹¹⁶ It is not surprising in view of such evidence that Ludwig von Pastor laid the principal share of the blame for the failure of the colloquy at the door of the Saxon elector.¹¹⁷ He might lose much as a result of concord, for example the ecclesiastical territory he had seized. During this very time he was in fact planning the incorporation of the bishopric of Naumburg into his states.

How concerned the elector was also comes out in his instructions to his counselors with regard to his chief theological representative at Ratisbon, Philip Melanchthon. The counselors were also to keep an eye on him and to observe who visited Melanchthon and see he did not visit anyone inadvisable. He should remain in his room and receive visitors there.¹¹⁸ One can see the results of this policy in the almost complete lack of contact between the Saxon counselors and Melanchthon on the one hand and Contarini on the other.¹¹⁹ Despite the fact that Melanchthon as well as Contarini was basically an irenic personality who would have welcomed concord, he early recognized that the principles set forth in the Regensburg Book could not serve as the basis for such a concord. Melanchthon had, in fact, labelled the Regensburg Book "Republic of Plato" upon first seeing it.¹²⁰ One indication of a brief contact between Contarini and Melanchthon is a brief reference by the former to two good chapters on the subject of good works written by Melanchthon.¹²¹

The acceptance of the fifth article of the Regensburg Book was, however, as has been pointed out, the turning point of the colloquy. On May 5th the Saxon counselors informed their elector that

the theologians of this part are not going, with God's help, to give up anything, and it has been pointed out to them several times that they are to continue to adhere to the (Augsburg) Confession and the Schmalkald Articles, to do which they are themselves inclined.¹²²

Decisive for the final rejection of any attempt at concord was Luther's negative attitude towards the agreed upon articles. Luther's unique importance was demonstrated at the height of the negotiations by the sending to him of what practically amounted to a special delegation to get his approval for the Regensburg Book. This was done ostensibly in the name of Joachim of Brandenburg but actually upon the wish of the emperor. John Frederick and his very able chancellor Brück hastened to Wittenberg. Luther answered the Hohenzollern in writing as follows:

These people, whoever they may be, mean quite well, but theirs are impossible proposals, which the pope, cardinals, bishops and canons can never accept. . . . It is useless to undertake concord with such means. Moreover there are many things therein which we shall not and cannot present to our people.¹²³

Thus Contarini had not been able to negotiate with the Saxons. The firmness of Luther and of the elector had foiled him completely. The only sign of any contact is the slight evidence that Melancthon wrote two chapters on good works which he not only presented to Contarini but also discussed, whether in writing or orally, with the cardinal.¹²⁴

THE CARDINAL AND THE CURIA

Reference has already been made to the vice-chancellor of the church Cardinal Farnese.¹²⁵ It was to him that Contarini reported in numerous letters the events that occurred at Ratisbon. One of the first things to engage the attention of the two cardinals in their correspondence upon Contarini's arrival in Ratisbon was the matter of the legate's stipend for May and June. Contarini seems to have been already paid the expenses for the first three months of his legation, February, March and April. He now sought to obtain the payment in advance of the funds for May and June, since he supposed that a long time would elapse between their payment in Rome and his reception of them in Ratisbon. He wrote letters to associates in Rome asking them to use their influence to this end, since he was not able to meet the many

expenses of the legation out of his own pocket.¹²⁶ When these *démarches* did not avail Contarini brought the matter up in a despatch to Farnese.¹²⁷ Addressing Farnese as his "*buon padrone et protettore operi*" he urgently requested payment of the two months' stipend and asked further for permission to spend the months of July and August in his diocese of Belluno rather than in the heat of Rome.¹²⁸ That Farnese does not seem to have trusted Contarini excessively comes out in the letter by Cardinal Pole written three weeks after this request.¹²⁹ Contarini had also asked the English cardinal to intervene. Pole reported that he had obtained the sending of the two months' stipend. With regard to his friend's second request Pole reported that

I decided first to test the Most Reverend Farnese's mind on this matter and explained it to him. He immediately said 'What? Doesn't he want to report on what he has done in his legation?'¹³⁰

After Pole had explained somewhat more fully Contarini's wish to visit in the ecclesiastical sense his diocese during the summer, Farnese seemed satisfied and Pole then decided to approach the pontiff himself with this request. Paul III did not express his actual approval but said that Contarini might perhaps be in no better spot to meet him (the pope) if he should decide to travel into Cisalpine Gaul "which he seems to be thinking of doing."¹³¹

The remainder of the correspondence between Contarini and Farnese maintained the same general tone. Neither seemed to trust or like the other especially. Undoubtedly Farnese viewed the Venetian as a newcomer who might be a dangerous rival in the Sacred College. Moreover Contarini did not follow the instructions given him to the letter.¹³² On April 14th he reported that he was not going to bring up to the emperor too early in the diet the necessity of his maintaining peace with Francis I since he (Contarini) did not wish to inspire the belief that he was seeking to prevent a concord.¹³³

On May 3rd Contarini sent his most significant and fateful despatch to Farnese. It included the fifth article on justification in the greatly altered form in which it had finally been accepted by both Protestant and Catholic collocutors (Eck included), by Morone, by Badia (the *maestro di sacro palazzo* who accompanied Contarini as theological advisor) and by Contarini himself.¹³⁴ On May 25th Contarini sent his "Epistle on Justification" to Rome in defense of the doctrine set forth in Article V.¹³⁵ The fifth article was at first seen by only a few persons in Rome, among them, of course, the pope and Cardinal Farnese as well as the latter's secretary, Niccolo Ardinhello.¹³⁶ In presenting the reactions of those who had seen the article to Contarini, Farnese no longer wrote to him directly but had his sec-

retary write in his name.¹³⁷ The language used by Ardinghella was quite strong in some passages.

Moreover I cannot say that the said article on justification has been either approved or rejected by His Holiness. I know quite well that all those who have seen it have said that, presupposing their sense be Catholic, the words could be clearer, and that as a consequence this previous article does not entirely avoid that ambiguous and false concord which Your Most Reverend Lordship has censured and abhorred in the two following (articles) on the eucharist and on confession. . . . It is His Holiness' firm intention that Your Most Reverend Lordship should neither publicly nor privately approve any statement which would have not merely the Catholic sense expressly determined by the Church but also such words as admit any danger of ambiguity . . . for Your Most Reverend Lordship well knows that you have in your person no public authority finally to define or to decide anything.¹³⁸

The "Epistle on Justification," composed by Contarini himself in explanation and defense of the teaching in the fifth article and sent by him to Rome on May 25th, was also known there when the pope and cardinals finally met in consistory on June 10th to consider these new developments in Ratisbon. The results of this consistory were disastrous for Contarini and his work. His friends made only a weak defense of Contarini's views on justification. Reginald Pole had left Rome and absented himself from the consistory ostensibly due to illness.¹³⁹ Led by Giampietro Caraffa the force of opposition to a conciliatory and irenic policy as represented by Contarini swept everything before them.¹⁴⁰ Contarini was officially informed of the results by another letter from Farnese's secretary on June 15th.¹⁴¹ Ardinghella informed Contarini that the sum of 50,000 *scudi* had now been deposited with Roman merchants to be held in account for the Catholic League and that the sum could be used either fully or partly for expenses in case of a war with the Protestants or for expenses if they were to accept the faith peacefully.¹⁴² Farnese's secretary continued that "as to the possibility of toleration" which was by this time being proposed by Charles and Granvelle in order to salvage something from the discussions

even if it were to embrace only one area and the Protestants were to agree to the truth in everything else, this does not merit being discussed since the articles that remain in controversy are so essential to the faith that, without a new authorization from our Lord Jesus Christ, we down here could not agree to them for we have the law that evil may not be done in order to produce good.¹⁴³

In view of Contarini's idealistic personality and his great efforts and sacrifice for the welfare of the church it was undoubtedly bitter for him to receive this sort of treatment from Farnese. But worse was to follow upon his return to Italy.

Even before Contarini left Ratisbon he felt some apprehension at the welcome he would receive in Italy.¹⁴⁴ No sooner had he crossed the Alps and arrived in Brescia than he was made aware publicly by a gentleman of that city, who was an old friend of his, of a wide-spread impression in Italy that he had gone too far in agreeing with the Lutherans. After retiring to the coolness of a hillside monastery retreat near Bologna and spending some pleasant weeks in conversations with the young monks there, among whom was one of his nephews, he contracted a fever and died after only a few days of illness at the age of fifty-nine on August 24, 1542.¹⁴⁵ It was well for Contarini that he died when he did. Only six weeks before his death the Inquisition under Caraffa had been established in Italy and Contarini's associate at Ratisbon, Morone, as well as many others of his friends and associates were, sooner or later, to find themselves in its toils.¹⁴⁶

The party in Italy which, because of its own basic religio-psychological similarities to the new groups north of the Alps, had favored a conciliatory attitude towards Protestantism had thus lost in Contarini its chief and soon dissolved. The doctrinal questions, especially those with regard to justification, were finally settled in a direction opposed to this party's tendencies, by the council of Trent. Even though, in Jansenist form, the discussion was to be renewed in France in the seventeenth century, one can only agree with Ranke in his final conclusion.

What a magnificent position it was which in him (Contarini) the moderate Catholic position had occupied! Since, however, it did not succeed in carrying out its universal mission (*Welt-Intention*) the question arose whether it would succeed merely in maintaining itself. Every great tendency carries within itself the unavoidable task of becoming dominant and effective. If it cannot attain such dominance its ruin is the consequence.¹⁴⁷

1. Such a study has been prepared by the writer and is currently being considered for publication by the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*. That paper and the present one were prepared under a Fairleigh Dickinson University Research Fellowship.
2. Dom H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* (Paris, Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1930), IX, 1, p. 62, "Tels étaient la situation et l'entourage de Contarini, que Paul III se proposait d'employer comme chef d'un parti réformiste, qui se grouperait à sa cour et au Sacré-Collège."
3. That Contarini did not feel too much at home is indicated by Giovanni della Casa, "Vita Gasparis Contareni," *Opere* (Firenze, Manni, 1707), III, 99, "...sed illud affirmo, hanc quasi migrationem [from Venice to Rome]

e sua in alienam, non illam quidem deterius, sed longe, longeque aliter moratam civitatem Contareno, ingravesciente iam aetate, subitam, ac repentinam necessario molestam fuisse."

Leclercq, the continuator of Hefele, comments in general, *op. cit.*, IX, 1, p. 61f., "Les plus actifs et les plus en vue...gravitaient autour de Contarini,...la célèbre poétesse Vittoria Colonna,...Camillo Orsini, Alexandre, Badia...les vieux curiaux...de l'Oratoire du divin amour au temps de Leon X."

In delineating these reform tendencies in Italy Ranke is at his very best, *vide* "Anfänge einer Regeneration des Katholicismus," *Die römischen Päpste* (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot, (1878), I, 87-152.

4. Fr. Dittrich ed., "Consilium quatuor delectorum a Paulo III super reformatione S. Romanae Ecclesiae," *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals Gasparo Contarini* (Braunsberg, Huye, 1881), 305-309. I have unfortunately not been able to see Fr. Dittrich, *Gasparo Contarini, 1483-1542. Eine Monographie* (Braunsberg, 1885). There is a copy in the British Museum, 10629g4.
5. Le Plat ed., "Gasparis Contareni Cardinalis ad Paulum III pont. max. de potestate pontificis in usu clavium epistola", *Opera*, II, 605-608; and "Ad Paulum III pont. max. de potestate pontificis in compositionibus epistola", *ibid.*, 608-615. There is a German translation of the latter by Stephan Agricola, "Gasparo Contarini, Von des Papstes zu Rom gewalt" (Dillingen, Mayer, 1560).
6. He was, however, very discriminating and careful. Thus in a letter from Brussels on April 28, 1522, he says of a holy hermit who wished to establish himself near Venice and who was rumored to have performed miracles, "Ea ego miracula neque facile credenda neque facile reiicienda censeo; hic tandem divino fortasse impulsu nuper magno desiderio est veniendi in Italiam, ac ad nos Venetos." Regia Deputazione di Storia Patria ed., *I Diarii di Marino Sanuto* (Venezia, Visentini, 1879-1903), XXXIII, 311.
7. Dittrich ed., "Capitoli della congregazione del Gesù confirmati da Paulo III", *op. cit.*, 304-305.
8. "Fuit consistorium S.D.N. creavit S.R.E. Legatum de latere Rmum Gasparem Presbyterum Cardinalem Contarenum in partibus Germaniae et ad ea potissimum loca, ad quae eum declinare contigerit, cum facultatibus prout in literis." Quoted from *Acta consistorialia variorum Pontificum*, Cod. Valicell. J. 61, f. 52 by Dittrich, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
9. A. M. Quirini ed., "Memoriale Rmi Dni Card. Contareni antequam discederet Germaniam versus datum Rmo Card. Sanctae Crucis", *Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli... Pars III* (Brixiae, Rizzardi, 1748), p. cccxiv.
10. "Instructio data Rmo D. Card. Contareno in Germaniam Legato," *ibid.*, cclxxxvi-ccie. For an illuminating discussion of his possible traveling companions, with an eye especially to their personalities, prepared by an anonymous, vide Hugo Laemmer ed., "Anonymi de theologis familiaribus cum Card. Contareno Legato in Germaniam mittendis iudicium", *Monumenta Vaticana* (Friburgi Brisg., Herder, 1861), 300-301. Cf. also Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg i. B., 1879), V, 300, and Gottlob Egelhaaf, *Deutsche Geschichte im sechzehnten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1892), II, 392.
11. He is accused of having indirectly contributed to his grandfather's death due to the shock sustained by Paul III when he discovered that Alessandro was implicated in a plot against him and as a consequence of the violent scenes that ensued during which the pontiff tore the red biretta out of the hands to which he had given it, vide Ranke, *Die römischen Päpste*, I, 176-177.
12. Hubert Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* (Freiburg, Herder, 1949), I, 351, "Noch wurde mit dem System der Benefizienkumulation in der Hand der Kardinäle nicht gebrochen; der Papstnepot Alessandro Farnese überbot sogar alles bisher Dagewesene auf diesem Gebiete." Cf. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, IX, 1, 109.
13. Quirini ed., *op. cit.*, III, cclxxxvi.
14. *Ibid.*, III, cclxxxix.
15. *Ibid.*, III, cclxxxix.
16. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, IX, 1, 148, "Un conseiller expérimenté comme Morone n'était pas superflu, car la bonté naturelle de Contarini ne se défiait peut-être pas assez des artifices luthériens; du reste, il ne connaissait pas suffisamment la théologie de Luther." For an account of his life and personality vide Franz Dittrich, "Die Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morone's vom Reichstage zu Regensburg 1541," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, IV (1883), 395-427.
17. Girolamo Negri to the bishop of Corfu, April 6, 1541; Dittrich ed., *op. cit.*, 166.
18. Contarini to Farnese, April 28, 1541. Ludwig von Pastor ed., "Die Korrespondenz des Kardinals Contarini während seiner deutschen Legation," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, I (1880), 361-371.
19. For Latin text with German translation vide K. T. Hergang, *Das Religions-Gespräch zu Regensburg i. J. 1541* (Cassel, Fischer, 1858). H. Eells, "The Origin of the Regensburg Book," *The Princeton Theological Review*, XXVI (1928), 355-372, should be used with caution. I have not been able to see H. Schäfer, *De libri Ratisbonensis origine atque historia* (Bonn, 1870), dissertation.
20. Who the actual authors were has been a subject of debate ever since. Vide Ludwig Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1879), 235-241; Manfred Rosenberg, *Gerhard Veltwyck, Orientalist, Theolog und Staatsmann* (Wiesbaden,

- Friedmann, 1935), dissertation—Göttingen; Hergang, *op. cit.*, 49-52.
21. Contarini to Matteo Dandolo. Theodor Brieger ed., "Zur Correspondenz Contarini's während seiner deutschen Legation", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III (1879), 520.
 22. Contarini to Farnese, May 29, 1541. Pastor ed., *loc. cit.*, I, 474-476. For excellent brief accounts *vide* Joseph Kardinal Hergenröther, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1907), IVte Auflage, III, 98-101; T. Kolde "Regensburger Religionsgespräch", *Protestantische Realencyklopädie* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1905), XVI, 545-548.
 23. Francesco Contarini to the Venetian senate, July 29, 1541. Dittrich ed., *op. cit.*, 221. The date is erroneously given as May 31 in Karl Brandi, *Kaiser Karl V* (München, Brückmann, 1937), I, 385.
 24. *Ide supra* p. 2.
 25. *Ide* Brandi, *op. cit.*, I, 386, for an excellent analysis of the actual effect of the failure of the Ratisbon colloquy upon Charles' personality and plans.
 26. Contarini to Farnese, March 13, 1541. Victor Schulze ed., "Dreizehn Depeschen Contarini's aus Regensburg an den Cardinal Farnese (1541)", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III (1879), 150-155. Cf. also Contarini to Pole, March 14, 1541, Dittrich ed., *Regesten und Briefe*, 155. What the emperor hoped to gain from the presence of a papal legate, and particularly of Contarini, in Ratisbon is clearly brought out in Poggio's letter to Farnese of February 5, 1541, Dittrich ed., "Die Nuntiaturbefehle Giovanni Morone's", *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IV, 659-666.
 27. Schulze ed., *loc. cit.*, 159.
 28. Granvelle sought to create an atmosphere of optimism about concord by spreading some rather wild rumors about Melancthon and certain Protestant cities. He seems to have taken Morone in somewhat, to judge by the latter's report to Farnese, March 21, 1541, Dittrich ed., *loc. cit.*, IV, 438-440. Granvelle probably thought thus indirectly to influence Contarini, since Morone seems to have discussed everything freely with the legate. Cf. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, IX, i 146.
 29. Contarini to Farnese, March 18, 1541: Schulze ed., *loc. cit.*, 159-161. "Sua Signoria stette quieta nè mi fece replica." *Ibid.*, p. 159.
 30. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
 31. Brandi, *op. cit.*, I, 375-376.
Die Auffassung der Politiker aber ging noch einen Schritt weiter, insofern sie neben den [religious] Anschauungen immer auch ihre menschlichen Träger und deren weltliche Möglichkeiten im Auge behielten... Er [Granvelle] war Diplomat geblieben und gab auch den Wormser Verhandlungen durch kluge Regie und unermüdelichen Fleiss einen gewissen äusseren Erfolg."
 32. Contarini to Farnese, April 5, 1541; Schulze ed., *loc. cit.*, 169-171.
 33. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
 34. Contarini to Farnese, April 1541, *ibid.*, 175-176. "Qui sua Mtà disse: le forze delli Turchi sono le nostre discordie; se noi fussimo concordi, non sariano grandi," *ibid.*, p. 175. Joachimsen states that there were two kinds of "Illusionisten" (his name for persons seeking concord)—religious and political. The former could not believe that the German reformers wanted anything basically different from their own deepest convictions. The latter wished to strengthen the empire *vis-à-vis* France and the Turks, Paul Joachimsen, *Die Reformation als Epoche der Deutschen Geschichte* (München, Oldenbourg, 1951), 232.
 35. Contarini to Farnese, April 1541; Schulze ed., *loc. cit.*, 175; "Mi rispose: da me non ha mancato: ho fatto quel ch' io debbo, et più di quello ch' io debbo. Ma in altri non si vede buona intentione, nè si vuole concordia fraterna, ma mando, cioè esser padrone et comandare..."
 36. *Ibid.*, 175, "Io qui modestamente li dissi: Sappiate certo V. Mtà, che tutta la cristianità non aspetta miglior nuova di questa nè li potria venir nuova, la qual si udisse con più allegrezza di questa. Disse sua Mtà: Dio lo faccia..."
 37. Contarini to Farnese, May 11 1541: Ludwig von Pastor ed., "Die Korrespondenz des Kardinals Contarini während seiner deutschen Legation," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, I (1880), 381-383.
 38. Contarini to Farnese, May 15, 1541: *ibid.*, 387-390.
 39. *Ibid.*, 389.
 40. Contarini to Farnese, June 2, 1541: *ibid.*, 477.
 41. Hergenröther, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*, III, 101.
 42. Contarini to Farnese, June 14, 1541: Pastor ed., *loc. cit.*, 481.
 43. *Ibid.*, 484. This would contradict statements recently made that the emperor "was deliberately stalling while he prepared for war." Hastings Eells, "The Failure of Church Unification Efforts during the German Reformation," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLII (1951), 160-174. This statement is on page 173.
 44. On Charles' conciliar policy *vide* August Korte, *Die Konzilspolitik Karls V in den Jahren 1538-1543* (Göttingen, 1935), 10-11.

- gen, 1905), dissertation. Also published as "No. 85" in its *Schriften* by the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte.
45. Contarini to Farnese, July 17, 1541: Pastor *ed., loc. cit.*, 496.
 46. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, I, 313.
 47. The following are most useful in studying this long vexed problem: Th. Brieger, "Gropper, Johann," *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften*, I. Sektion, Bd. 92, S. 218 ff.; Wilhelm van Gulik, *Johannes Gropper (1503 bis 1559)* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1906); Walter Lippens, *Kardinal Johannes Gropper, 1503-1559: und die Anfänge der Katholischen Reform in Deutschland* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1951, Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte); Ludwig Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1879), 235, 241.
 48. I have not been able to see Albrecht Linsenmann, "Albertus Pighius und sein theologischer Standpunkt," *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift*, IV (1866), 571 ff.
 49. Carl Joseph von Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1890), 937. The question of Contarini's beliefs about double justification and his theological development in general are treated by Hanns Rückert, *Die theologische Entwicklung Gasparo Contarinis* (Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1926).
 50. Hefele, *op. cit.*, 936.
 51. C. Varrentrapp, *Hermann von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln* (Leipzig, 1878).
 52. Lutz Hatzfeld, "Dr. Gropper, die Wetterauer Grafen und die Reformation in Kurköln 1537-1547," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XXXVI (1954), Heft 2, 208-230. Hatzfeld shows very clearly how important it is to keep in mind in this period, besides Catholic "Reform" and Protestant "Reformation," the *Realpolitik* of the different princes. Gropper's importance as the chief opponent of the archbishop's reform tendencies remains, however, unshaken despite Hatzfeld's efforts to disprove the views of Lippens. *Vide* Lippens, *op. cit.*
 53. *Vide supra* p. 7.
 54. Cf. Gulik, *op. cit.*, 70-71.
 55. Contarini to Farnese, April 28, 1541, Pastor *ed., loc. cit.*, 361-371. Melancthon was also of this opinion, *vide* Pastor, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 235, 241.
 56. Hubert Jedin, *Contarini und Camaldoli* (Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1953). Cf., also by the same author, *Kardinal Contarini als Kon-*
troversthologe (Münster i. W., Aschendorff, 1949).
 57. Contarini to Farnese, May 3, 1541: Pastor *ed., loc. cit.*, 372.
 58. Morone to Farnese, May 3, 1541: Dittrich *ed., Regesten und Briefe*, 177-178.
 59. *Ibid.*
 60. Contarini to Farnese, July 26, 1541: Schultze *ed., loc. cit.*, 183-184.
 61. *Ibid.*
 62. Dandino to Contarini, March 25, 1541: Dittrich *ed., Regesten und Briefe*, 160.
 63. A. M. Quirinus, "Diatriba," *Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli, Pars III*, lxi.
 64. Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, V, 305. Johannes Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg i. B., 1899), III, 501.
 65. Contarini to Dandino, April 1, 1541: Dittrich *ed., op. cit.*, 318-319.
 66. Contarini to the cardinal of Ferrara, April 12, 1541 *ibid.*, 167.
 67. The cardinal of Mantua to Contarini, May 17, 1541: Quirini *ed., op. cit.*, III, cclxxviii-cclxxxiii.
 68. Contarini to nuntius in France, June 2, 1541: Dittrich *ed., op. cit.*, 191-192.
 69. Contarini to nuntius in France, June 12, 1541: *ibid.*, 197.
 70. Contarini to Dandolo, July 1541: Brieger, "Zur Correspondenz Contarini's während seiner deutschen Legation," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III (1879), 519-521.
 71. *Ibid.*, 521.
 72. Contarini to Farnese, March 16, 1541: Schultze *ed., loc. cit.*, 156-158.
 73. *Ibid.*, 157.
 74. *Ibid.*, 156.
 75. "Imperocche, quando Cesare volesse tender a via non buona, potrà molto valermi dell'autorità loro et altri Cathoi." *Ibid.*, 157.
 76. Francesco Contarini to the Venetian senate, March 26, 1541: Dittrich *ed., op. cit.*, 161-162.
 77. Contarini to Farnese, March 30, 1541: Schultze *ed., loc. cit.*, 164-166.
 78. Morone to Farnese, May 23, 1541: Fr. Dittrich *ed.*, "Die Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morone's," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IV, 463-465.
 79. Contarini to Farnese, June 19, 1541: Pastor *ed.*, "Die Korrespondenz des Kardinals Contarini," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, I, 483-486.
 80. Brandi, *Karl V*, I, 386.
Nun aber änderte sich offenbar etwas im tiefsten Innern des Kaisers . . . wir dürfen annehmen, dass er im Grunde seines Wesens in diesen Tagen, nicht wie in Augsburg aus Enttäuschung und gekränktem Hoheitsgefühl, sondern aus wachsender Einsicht in die Natur der Dinge an der Durchführbarkeit einer Einigung Deutschlands mit

- friedlichen Mitteln zu verzweifeln begann, dass er jetzt—aber erst jetzt, nachdem er alles versucht hatte—auch die Wege der Herzöge von Braunschweig und Bayern zu gehen geneigt war, sobald die allgemeine Lage es ihm ermöglichte.
81. Farnese to Contarini, June 23, 1541: Dittrich *ed.*, *Regesten und Briefe*, 203.
 82. Contarini to Farnese, July 28, 1541: *ibid.*, 345-346.
 83. Contarini to Dandolo, July 1541: Brieger *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 521.
 84. Theodor Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck* (Regensburg, 1865).
 85. Eck to Farnese, April 1, 1541: Dittrich *ed.*, *Regesten und Briefe*, 162: "Mitiores facti sunt. Cur autem non vocer Ratisbonam, miror: iniussus non venio."
 86. Contarini to Farnese, April 18, 1541: Pastor *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 365-366.
 87. *Vide* Contarini's letters to Eck to see the skillful manner in which the Venetian guided the Bavarian. Contarini to Eck, April 24, 1540: Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 310-311. Also Contarini to Eck, May 26, 1540: *ibid.*, 311. As an example of Contarini's salesmanship,—even before the colloquy had begun,—Contarini to Eck, January 6, 1541: *ibid.*, 314.
Verum vehementer commotus sum, quod ex tuis literis intellexi parum te spei habere, futuram esse reconciliationem animorum in hoc religionis negotio nobilissimae istius vestrae nationis, neque hoc schisma, quod inimicus homo fecit, ut in evangelio, in ecclesia Christi resarciendum esse nostra hac tempestate... Verum, doctissime Echii, etiam in causa desperata non est omnino viro christiano desperandum, quem deceat credere in spem etiam contra spem..."
 88. August Blatter, *Die Tätigkeit Melancthons bei den Unionsversuchen 1539-1547* (Bern, Genossenschaftsbuchdruckerei, 1899), dissertation.
 89. Contarini to Farnese, April 28, 1541: Pastor *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 361-371.
 90. Contarini to Dandolo, July 1541: Brieger *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 520: "...mi disse poi havere notato, che si diceva in questo libro quod Deus erat causa efficiens nostrae salutis et Christus erat causa subefficiens, il che a lui pareva essere errore Ariano."
 91. *Ibid.*, 520, "...io gli risposi che il libro stava bene, perchè intendeva di Cristo come uomo, il quale dal Damasceno et molti altri Teologi ci chiamano: instrumentum primum divinitatis, et però si poteva chiamare subefficiens causa: resto queto." The last two words are amazing indeed in connection with Eck.
 92. Morone to Farnese, April 28, 1541: Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 174.
 93. Morone to Farnese, May 3, 1541: *ibid.*, 177. Cf. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, I, 308.
 94. Contarini to the cardinal of Mantua, May 3, 1541: Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 177.
 95. Contarini to Farnese, May 13, 1541: Pastor *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 383-387. Contarini to Farnese, May 30, 1541: Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 190.
 96. Contarini to Farnese, May 30, 1541; *ibid.*, 190. Cervini to Contarini, June 14, 1541; *ibid.*, 198.
 97. Johann Eck, *Apologia pro Reverend. et Illustris. Principibus Catholicis, ac alijs ordinibus Imperij adversus mucros et calumnias Bucerii, super actis Comitiarum Ratisponae. Apologia pro Reverendiss. se. ap. Legato et Cardinale, Gasparo Contareno* (Ingolstadtij Bajoriae excusa. M.D. XLII), p. cxxx.
Ex charitate et nimia mansuetudine incomparabilis ille vir legatus pontificius persuasit sibi meliora de Bucero et socijs, futurum scilicet, ut aliquando respicerent: at si ista mecum contulisset, admonissem eum de S. Paulo, qui optime novit haereticorum obstinationem.
 98. Blatter, *Die Thätigkeit Melancthons bei den Unionsversuchen*, 151, "Der Kaiser hatte also den Landgrafen ebenso nötig wie dieser die Gnade des Reichsoberhauptes in seiner misslichen Angelegenheit gut brauchen konnte."
There is great disagreement as to who actually made the first move. Pastor in 1879 claimed Gropper had begun the theological conversations on the orders of Hermann von Wied, Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, 241. In a later work Pastor insisted that the landgrave had been the originator, Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, V, 298. Gulik gives both sides and there is as much choice for one as for the other, Gulik, *Johannes Gropper*, 70-71.
 99. *Vide supra* p. 7.
 100. Lodovico Beccatelli, *Vita di Gasparo Contarini* (Brixiae, Rizzardi, 1748), p. exviii.
 101. Johann Wilhelm Baum, *Capito und Butzer, Strassburgs Reformatoren* (Elberfeld, Friderichs, 1860).
 102. Contarini to Farnese, April 18, 1541: Pastor *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 365-366.
 103. Negri to an anonymous, April 30, 1541; Victor Schultze *ed.*, "Fünfzehn Depeschen aus Regensburg vom 10. März bis 28. Juni 1541," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III (1879), 637-640.
 104. Contarini to Farnese, May 23, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 185-186. Contarini to Farnese, June 24, 1541; *ibid.*, 204.

105. It is rather amusing to contrast the two accounts. Gulik, *op. cit.*, 71. Gropper berichtet (*Wahrhaftig Antwort*, fol. 38b): 'Und deweil dan die handlung sich in lenge verzoge, so begerte er (Butzer) wol, dass derr herr Sekretary und ich ihn sampt... (Capito)...anhören und uns mit ihnen in ein verträut gesprech einlassen wölten: daraus ist der herr Sekretary, doch nitt on fürwissen seiner herren bewegt worden, solchs mir zukennen zu geben.' Ganz entgegengesetzt lautet die Darstellung Butzers. (*De Concilio*, fol. 2b): 'Vuormacia e vero numquam ab illo vel etiam a Gerardo Secretario quicquam de Colloquio secretiore inter nos instituendo vel monui vel petii, imo ipsi duo, me nihil tale cogitante clarissimum Capitonem et me ad hoc Colloquium priores invitarunt.'
106. Beccatelli, *op. cit.*, p. cxviii. Et Martino Bucero andando a visitare il Legato disse proprio così: Reverendissime Domine, utrinque peccatum est, dum nos quaedam nimis obstinate defendimus, contra vero abusus multos vos non corrigitis, sed Domino concedente veritas illustrabitur, et ad concordiam deveniemus.
107. Contarini to Farnese, May 3, 1541; Pastor *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 372-375.
108. Morone to Farnese, May 3, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 177-178. Morone to Farnese, May 11, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, "Die Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morone's," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IV, 455-460.
109. Butzer to Martin Frecht, July 5, 1541; Max Lenz *ed.*, *Der Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps mit Bucero* (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1880), II, 25n, "Jam legato Antichristi onus grave impositum est. Ante enim privatim librum approbavit, nunc palam id non audebit." Lenz also helps to clarify the matter of who first started the discussions from which the Regensburg Book sprang. Without Philip of Hesse's support they would never have reached an end, according to the landgrave himself. Unterredung des Landgrafen mit Granvella und Naves. 7. Juni... Zum andern sollte s.f.g. in der religionsachen den fleis thun, der s.f.g. möglich were, den auch s.f.g. mit Got und gutem gewissen thun konte.—Darauf hat sein f.g. zufelliglich geantwortet, so f.g. het's gethan, sonst wer es mit dem privato colloquio so weit nicht komen. (*Ibid.*, III, 86).
110. Martin Bucero, *Acta Colloquii in Comitibus Imperii Ratisponae habiti* (Argentorati, mense September M.D. XLI), 70. Vt ergo Imperat. Maiestas acta colloquij expendenda tradidisset legato Romano, Gaspari Contareno, viro quidem aetate, eruditione et moribus grauissimo. et reverendo: sed qui, quid persona, quam Roma, pontifex ei imposuisset, requireret, plus satis consideraverit.
111. Contarini to Farnese, March 20, 1541; Schultze *ed.*, "Dreizehn Depeschen Contarini's," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III, 162-164. "Di Saxonia disse etiam, che verrebbe." *Ibid.*, 162.
112. For the unusual importance of these counselors for the course of the Reformation vide Theodor Kolde, *Der Kanzler Brück und seine Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Reformation* (Halle, Perthes, 1874), dissertation.
113. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider *ed.*, Document # 2162, *Corpus Reformatorum* (Halis Saxonum, Schwetschke, 1837), IV, 123-132.
114. *Ibid.*, 126.
115. *Ibid.*, 128.
116. *Ibid.*, 128.
117. Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, 278. See also his introduction to "Die Korrespondenz des Cardinals Contarini," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, I, 324.
118. Bretschneider *ed.*, "Philippum Melancthon belangend," *op. cit.*, IV, 131. The apprehension on the part of the elector with regard to Melancthon must be understood against the background of the latter's controversy with Cordatus in 1537 which had left the elector highly suspicious of Melancthon. Vide also Blatter, *Die Tätigkeit Melancthons bei den Unionsversuchen*, passim; J. Döllinger, *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen* (Arnheim, Witz, 1854), III, 317-321. Franz Hildebrandt, *Melancthon: Alien or Ally?* (Cambridge, U. P.; New York, Macmillan, 1946) although not referring directly to Ratisbon casts many valuable insights.
119. But cf. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, 331.
120. Pastor, *op. cit.*, 242.
121. Contarini to an anonymous cardinal (Caraffa or Aleander? Brieger thinks it is the former), July 22, 1541; Brieger *ed.*, "Zur Correspondenz Contarini's," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, III, 516-519. "Quanto... delle opere precedenti la gratia... il Melantone m'haveva scritto due capitoli buoni...." *Ibid.*, 517. I have not been able to find any other reference to these. Hanns Rückert, however, found another reference to them in a letter of Pole to Contarini, June 10, 1537; Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, II, 68. Rückert eliminates the possibility that they could be the *Confutatio* and in-

- sists "Also muss sich die oben angeführte Stelle aus dem Briefe Poles auf eine andere uns nicht erhaltene Auseinandersetzung Contarinis mit Melancthon beziehen." Hanns Rückert, *Die Theologische Entwicklung Gasparo Contarinis* (Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1926), 6n.
- How little Contarini's work for concord was understood on the Protestant side can be seen in Calvin's comments. He was also present at Ratisbon as a representative of Strassburg, *Corp. Ref.*, XXXIX, 173-179. This Protestant misunderstanding of Contarini's role can be traced right through to 1800. Veit Seckendorff, *Ausführliche Historie des Luthertums* (Leipzig, Gleditsch, 1714), 1971, has some insight, however. Christian August Salig, *Vollständige Historie der Augsbургischen Confession* (Halle, Renger, 1730), I, 509-516, is typical in hardly mentioning Contarini. Gottlieb Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung... unsres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs* (Leipzig, Crusius, 1798), III, 2, 160-166, completely misunderstands Contarini's role.
122. The Saxon counselors to the Saxon elector, May 5, 1541; Bretschneider *ed.*, *op. cit.*, IV, 254.
 123. Quoted in Pastor, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 241.
 - On this delegation to see Luther *cf.* also Theodor Brieger, *Gasparo Contarini und das Concordienwerk des Jahres 1541* (Gotha, Perthes, 1870), dissertation.
 124. *Vide* footnote 121.
 125. *Vide supra* pp. 4-5.
 126. Contarini to the cardinal di Rimini, April 2, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 163, "...perche io da me non ho et le spese sono grandi et sopra le forze mie." In a similar vein—Contarini to the datarius Capodiferro, April 2, 1541: *ibid.*, 163.
 127. That Contarini was depending on funds from other sources is revealed by his receipt for 500 gold *scudi* received from a bill of exchange originating in Venice and drawn upon the Augsburg banker Baumgartner. It is dated four days after the despatches cited in the preceding footnote. Dittrich *ed.*, "Quittung für 500 Scudi in Gold," *op. cit.*, 167.
 128. Contarini to Farnese, April 3, 1541; Schultze *ed.*, *loc. cit.*, 166-169.
 129. Pole to Contarini, April 24, 1541; Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 22.
 130. *Ibid.*, 22.
 131. Paul III did in fact later in the year travel in that direction in order to meet the emperor upon his entry into Italy.
 132. *Vide supra* pp. 4-6.
 133. Contarini to Farnese, April 14, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 168-169. See also Louis Maimbourg, *Histoire de Lutheranisme* (Paris, 1681), III, 251.
 134. Contarini to Farnese, May 3, 1541; Dittrich *ed.*, *op. cit.*, 177.
 135. Quirini *ed.*, "Gasparis Contareni Cardinalis Tractatus seu Epistola de Justificatione," *op. cit.*, III, pp. cxcxi. Quirini also gives the passages suppressed or altered in the Venetian edition of 1589 of Contarini's works and compares these changes or suppressions in a chart with the Parisian edition of 1571. Contarini's brief introduction to the "Epistle" was discovered and published by Dittrich, *op. cit.*, 332.
 136. For important auxiliary material for this article see Fr. Dittrich, *Miscellanea Ratisbonensis a. 1541* (Brunsbürgae, Typis Heyneanis — R. Siltmann, 1892).
 137. Niccolo Ardinghella to Contarini, May 29, 1541; Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, III, pp. cexxi-cxli. Brandi, *op. cit.*, I, 385, claims that the article was submitted to the whole consistory on May 27 and was censured by it.
 138. Niccolo Ardinghella to Contarini, May 29, 1541; Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, III, p. cxxxii.
 139. *Cf.* the pathetic letter in which Pole sought to excuse his absence to Contarini, Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, III, 26-30.
 140. Giuseppe de Leva, "La Concordia Religiosa di Ratisbone e il Cardinale Gaspare Contarini," *Archivio Veneto*, IV (1872), 5-36.
 141. Ardinghella to Contarini, June 15, 1541 (erroneously dated through printer's error "MDXL"); Quirini *ed.*, *op. cit.*, III, cxli-cxlii.
 142. *Ibid.*, cxli and cxliii.
 143. *Ibid.*, cxlii.
 144. This comes out very clearly in a letter by Contarini to Cardinal Gonzaga, July 19, 1541; W. Friedenburg *ed.*, "Der Briefwechsel Gasparo Contarini's mit Ercole Gonzaga nebst einem Briefe Giovanni Carafa's," *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, II, 216.
- Io hebbi heri una brevissima lettera di V. S. Rma de 7 in loco de una longa, la quale expectava in la materia de iustificazione... ma forse etiam essa è scandalizata, come intendo essere molti a Roma, questo Christo fu sempre scandalo et pur sempre ha vinto ogni obstaculo! spero quando che io parlerò cum lei, et in corte cum quelli che si sono scandalizati, che li satisferrò di modo che si acqueteranno.
145. Beccadelli, *op. cit.*, cxxxv. Giovanni della Casa, *Vita Gasparis Contareni (Brixiae, Rizzardi, 1748)*, clxxxvi.

- Eubel erroneously gives September 1 as the date: Conrad Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* (Monasterii, sumptibus et typis librariae Regensbergianae, 1910), III, 26.
146. Contarini himself, many years before, while Venetian ambassador to Charles V, had met and defeated the Spanish Inquisition while in Spain. He gave, in his report to Venice, a very spirited account of the energetic manner in which he brought about the release of a group of merchants of Venice who were being held because they had brought into Spain and were selling a Latin, Hebrew and Syriac Bible with the exposition of Rabbi Salomon. Contarini immediately spoke to Charles and to his council but was given little hope by them. Finally he was permitted to address the council of the Inquisition and delivered a speech on the customs of Italy in such matters that must have made an impression, for the Venetians were released that very night. Contarini to the Venetian senate, February 7, 1524; Sanuto *ed.*, *I Diarii*, XXXVIII, 202.
147. Ranke, *Die römischen Päpste*, I, 111. That the Pauline and Augustinian emphases supported by Contarini are, however, by no means dead in the Italy of today comes out clearly in much devotional material, e.g. Orfanotrofio Antoniano "Cristo Re" *ed.*, *Pasqua con noi* (Messina, 1957).
- Another statement that is *apropos* is by Roland H. Bainton, "Luther and the Via Media at the Marburg Colloquy," *Lutheran Quarterly*, I (November, 1949), 394-398.
- A group which thus stands in the middle is advantageously situated to operate as a reconciler of extremes. Sharing in a measure the view of each, it can seek to interpret the one to the other; but the median position has also its disadvantages for the mediator, because an advance in one direction produces commonly a recoil in the other. Should the middle join hands with the right, then the door is closed to the left, and vice versa. To prevent a partial unity at the expense of a complete schism, the middle party commonly avoids going too far in either direction, and thus the supreme achievement of the *via media* is that it succeeds in remaining the *via media*.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of that year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.

THE COVENANT IDEA AS A REVOLUTIONARY SYMBOL: SCOTLAND, 1596-1637*

S. A. BURRELL, *Barnard College*

I should like to call attention once again to the old home truth that ideas, while they may not be completely independent of their environment, are still possessed of a heredity of their own that can and often does transform the material circumstances of man and affect the course of history. I have chosen for purposes of illustration the covenant or federal theological conception, which worked a powerful influence in Scottish society during the early decades of the seventeenth century and which, in turn, was peculiarly influenced and reshaped by that society until it evolved into a symbol for the revolution which terminated in the overthrow of the monarchy of Charles I. In brief, it is my conviction that this rebellion against Charles and his government was primarily and mainly, though not solely, the result of a religious ferment that had been brewing for forty years.

To those who know something of the history of Scottish Presbyterianism or of the Covenanting period in Scottish history this may not seem a particularly surprising conclusion. The religious bases of the Scottish uprising against Charles I have always seemed so self-evident as to require no defence. And yet, just as it is a fashionable tendency among some scholars at the moment to play down the element of religion as a cause of the English Civil Wars so it has become fashionable to argue that the revolt of Presbyterian Scotland was, in reality, caused by a number of discontents for which the religious issue was only a cloak. Now, there is no denying, as I have already suggested, that this upheaval was the result of tensions not all of which were religious in nature. The Scottish nobility, gentry, and merchants had specific grievances, both economic and political, against the king. On the other hand, neither can it be denied that the form taken by the rebellion, the language of the revolutionary manifestoes, and the symbolic conception expressed in the National Covenant of 1638, all indicate how comprehensive the cause of religion was. Indeed, it was the one cause that gave unity and popular strength to the movement. It is, after all, significant that whether all those who rebelled against the king were truly religious or no they at least formally recognized the need to express their dissatisfaction in religious terms. In that sense we must agree that the operating ideals of Scottish society were derived from a widely accepted belief that religion was something important enough to most Scotsmen to justify the extremity of rebellion.

*A paper read before the joint session of the American Society of Church History and the American Historical Association, Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., on December 28, 1957.

To understand how it was that religious discontent and the symbolism of a theological conception were able to make a revolution, we must look backward from the year 1637, when rebellion against the king first began, across a period of about forty years during which the minds of Scotsmen were being prepared for this eventuality. In the development of the revolutionary symbolism it cannot, of course, be claimed that ideas alone played a decisive part. The National Covenant was more than the creation of pure theology. It was also the product of a long-standing indigenous tradition which in the years between 1596 and 1637 was slowly and almost unconsciously assimilated into the covenant theological scheme with such thoroughness that the product of this fusion became something so apparently Scottish as to cause its foreign origins to be forgotten.

Let us begin our examination of this complex process by looking first at its purely Scottish component. This latter was the ancient custom of private "banding" or "bonding," usually for the common defence of lives and property. How this custom came into existence we cannot be certain. There were elements in it of the feudal oath of fealty and of the clan-family relationship, though by the seventeenth century the practice of private bonding had developed into something distinct from both of these. Very probably its origins must be sought in the necessities of Scottish life, for Scotland was a country without strong central government, where the crown's writ was honored more frequently in the breach than in the observance. Lacking the security of public sanction against disturbers of the peace, Scotsmen found a solution to the problem by forming vendetta-like groups bound together by sworn pledges of fidelity. While the existence of such bonds afforded a measure of security to those who were bound by them, it also compounded the problems of the monarchy whose power and authority were continually menaced by these extra-legal combinations. Time after time Scottish kings legislated against the practice, but to little avail.¹ At the beginning of the seventeenth century, despite the modest success of James VI (afterwards James I of England) in strengthening the power of Scottish kingship, it was still as prevalent as ever.

To illustrate the commonness of the practice and its anarchical tendencies a few examples will suffice. Typical were the bonds of manrent by which an individual, usually a small landholder or freeman, contracted for the protection of a powerful neighboring landlord. According to the established formula, in return for security against "thievery, pillage, murther, ravishment, riot, hamesucken [the custom of burning individuals alive in their own dwellings], or cattle lifting" the freeman in turn bound himself, his wife and children in service to the great neighbor and the latter's heirs "to be with their

tenants at all times in readiness in hosting, hunting and watching within the country in the same manner as the . . . [neighbor's] own tenants."² Note here that there was nothing in this contractual arrangement that denoted servile status or obligation. The agreement implied no loss of lands or freedom on the part of the lesser man but was simply a contractual statement of common obligation.

A non-permanent form of private contracting was used to form temporary political alliances or factions. Thus, in 1567, the friends of the notorious Earl of Bothwell, paramour and afterwards husband to Mary Queen of Scots, rallied to defend him against charges that he had murdered the queen's second husband, Lord Darnley. In his behalf Bothwell's supporters published a bond in which they engaged that:

We, and everyone of us, by ourselves, kin, friends, and assisters, partakers, and all that will do for us shall take sincere, plain and upright part with him, to his defence and maintenance of his quarrel, with our bodies and goods, against all his private or public calumniators, bypast or to come or any other whatsoever, presuming anything in word or deed to his reproach, dishonour or infamy.³

In the end, the crown, since it was unable to suppress the practice, did what it had done so often in the Scottish past and tried to make the custom serve the state by organizing, in 1590, a "general bond" by which all the landholders of the kingdom were pledged to enforce the law in their own communities for all time coming.⁴

The prevalence of such a custom almost naturally led to its adoption for religious purposes from the time of the Scottish Reformation onward. The earliest religious bond drawn up by Protestants—and, as a consequence, often referred to by Scottish historians as the First Covenant—was entered into by John Knox, John Erskine of Dun, and a number of "gentlemen of Forfarshire" in 1556 as a protective measure against the Regent Mary of Lorraine. During the two succeeding generations other religious contracts of a similar nature were drawn up by various factions in times of crisis. Because the language of these agreements was usually drawn from Scripture it has been customary to label them "covenants," but the appellation is actually incorrect except in the most general sense. No one of these that I have ever seen was described specifically as a "covenant" by contemporaries; and none of them embodied either the language or the schematology of the later covenant theology.⁵ Until the end of the century they were simply pledged contracts of association. Of these, the language of the so-called Leith Covenant, drawn up in July 1572, is typical. Its subscribers, who were supporters of the young James VI against the party of his mother, Queen Mary, engaged themselves

. . . in the fear of God the Father, of His Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit . . . that we in all times hereafter, with our lives, lands, and goods, and all that we may make, shall set forward and

promote the blessed Evangel of our our Lord Jesus Christ, professed by us within this realm . . . and maintain with the King's Majesty, our sovereign Lord's authority, his Regent and nobility, assistants to his grace. . . .⁶

It was not, in fact, until after 1590 that the term "covenant" was first used to describe this custom of religious bonding, an innovation which, I should like to suggest, was more than the result of mere coincidence. By the latter date Scottish theologians had become aware of the new federal theological scheme which was already widely accepted on the Continent and among the English Puritans. So far as I have been able to discover, the first example of this new influence among Scottish divines is to be found in a series of sermons delivered on the subject of the Lord's Supper by the well-known Edinburgh preacher, Robert Bruce, in 1589.⁷ In the decade following there appeared the first published works of the leading Scottish elaborator of the federal theology, Robert Rollock, Rector of the newly-founded University of Edinburgh. Rollock, however—like many contemporary Reformed theologians outside Scotland—expanded the conception into a double-covenant scheme which covered works as well as grace. From what sources Rollock first derived his knowledge of the covenant idea we cannot say with accuracy, though it is probable that they were Continental rather than English.⁸ Even as Rollock was writing, however, the first public effects of the covenant scheme were manifested in a dramatic way. In the spring of 1596 the general assembly of the church, fearful of King James's rumored opposition to the presbyterian system and alarmed at his apparent temporizing with a faction of Catholic nobles, called for a mutual bond among the ministry. Here, for the first time, the word "covenant" was actually used in a fashion so precise and explicit as to make it clear that this was something very different from the older bonds of religious association.⁹ Before the year was out this practice of public covenanting had spread from presbytery to presbytery across the kingdom. From the account of eye-witnesses like James Melville we know that hundreds and possibly even thousands of persons were made contractors under the new religious bond on such a scale that it may be said without exaggeration that the Scottish kirk had literally created within the space of a few months a new liturgical form with a wide mass appeal.¹⁰

What seems to me most significant in this transfusion of custom and theology is that it indicates not only how widely accepted the new theological scheme was, but that it was not a purely indigenous invention as many historians of the Scottish church have thought. Once they knew of it, Scottish churchmen embraced it and blended it so thoroughly with the national custom of private bonding that it seemed to later generations a peculiarly Scottish religious manifestation. Re-

cent scholarship, particularly in the United States, has made us aware, however, of the parochial nature of this view; for the covenant conception we now know was shared by Protestant groups as widely separated as Transylvania, Ireland, and New England. In this connection, though I should like to avoid any pretence to detailed knowledge of the subject, it seems to me that the origins and growth of the federal scheme may best be explained, despite some variations in the application of the idea among some sects and in certain areas, in ecclesiastical rather than in any other terms. First of all, the idea is so explicit in Scripture as to make it almost inconceivable that the intense Protestant Biblicists of the post-Reformation era should have overlooked it. And, second, it met the needs of that most important of all ecclesiastical functions, the cure of souls. In Scotland at least, and certainly among the English Puritans, it enabled the clergy to introduce exhortation into homiletics without, at the same time, destroying man's ultimate dependence upon divine grace as the sole means of salvation. Most seventeenth-century Scottish divines were aware of the danger implicit in the idea of covenant, namely that by stressing the contractual aspects of the scheme they might be opening the door to freedom of the will—to Pelagianism or, even worse from their point of view, to Arminianism. They were fully conscious of this possibility, however, and strove to maintain what they called "the middle way of God's truth" between what they regarded as the two dangerous extremes of Catholic and Arminian theology on the one hand and Antinomianism on the other. As one of the most eminent of them wrote in answer to the charge that the covenant scheme denigrated divine grace and exalted the human will:

. . . None of us say, the crowne is given, either for faith, or for good works, as if they should determine the Lord to give a reward, or lay bands upon him for the intrinsecall dignitie and meritorious vertue that Christs merit hath put upon our works; we utterly deny any such vertue, either in good works, considered in their own nature, or as they borrow some perfume of Christs meriting vertue. . . . For Justification if it merit all the favor and blessings of God, then it must merit the favour of eternal election to glory, or effectual calling, of Christs coming in the flesh, of free Redemption, of the sending of the Gospel of Grace to this nation, rather than to this; whereas all these goe before justification, and flow from a more ancient and eternall free grace then justification; even from eternall election and everlasting love.¹¹

While the leaders of the Scottish kirk did their best to preserve the theological orthodoxy of the covenant idea in the traditional Calvinist way, they also transformed it, not theoretically but practically, in the forty-year period between 1596 and 1637. By the end of that time it had become in popular language not an elaboration of God's compact with the elect but the justification for a special divine bond between God and the people of Scotland. Thus by a shift in emphasis the cove-

nant of grace was transmuted into a new covenant of Abraham under which the kingdom of Scotland supplanted ancient Israel as God's covenanted nation.

Before we go on to assume, as many critics of seventeenth-century Scottish Presbyterianism have assumed, that this transformation of the personal covenant into a national covenant was solely the result of an astonishing xenophobic arrogance on the part of a small, backward, and somewhat isolated people on the periphery of northern Europe, let us stop for a moment and try to look at the world as it appeared to many leaders of the Scottish kirk in the seventeenth century. Only in this way can we understand how their thought came to be permeated with a sense of the imminence of some grand historical climax which would reveal the truth of Christian eschatology once for all to all mankind.

In the first place, we must keep in mind the particular historical circumstances that had given rise to Scottish Presbyterianism and the peculiar problems with which it was confronted in its relations with the crown. Fortunate happenstance at the time of the Scottish Reformation had given the Scottish church an opportunity afforded no other Reformed church in Europe. The weakness of the crown and the support of a strong faction among the nobility made it possible for John Knox and his associates to establish an ecclesiastical system which could claim to have inherited all the rights and powers of the medieval church which it had displaced. During the minority of James VI, which lasted from 1566 to 1587, the kirk under a succession of strong leaders was able to extend its authority through the most populous areas of the kingdom with such success that by the time King James was ready to challenge its power it was already a formidable institution whose membership unquestionably included a majority of Scottish Protestants. The significance of this rapid growth can scarcely be exaggerated, for it gave to the kirk advantages possessed by no other church within the Calvinist tradition. This expansion made the supporters of Scottish Calvinism not a militant minority like the English Puritans or the French Huguenots but a body which could quite plausibly speak of itself as the Christian Church in Scotland. Furthermore, this was a greater victory than that of the Calvinists in the Low Countries because Scottish churchmen were not driven by expediency or for any other reason to grant toleration to other religious groups; and it overshadowed Calvin's success at Geneva because here was not a municipality but a nation that had been reformed. The magnitude of this triumph, which was finally achieved after a great deal of uncertainty by the legal establishment of a fullblown presbyterian system of government in 1592, was to have an important influence on Scottish reli-

gious thought. In the minds of Scottish churchmen this was a culmination which demonstrated the singular favor of divine providence, for theirs, it seemed, was a more perfect reformation than that achieved by any other church in Christendom.¹² Unhappily, their rejoicing was short, for in the hour of success the monarch whose authority they had long and successfully challenged found himself at last in a position to limit the church's power. This James accomplished by the direct and almost too simple method of buying the support of the impecunious Scots nobles by granting to them the large ecclesiastical holdings that had come into the crown's possession at the time of the Reformation. With the two strongest elements in Scottish society thus split asunder James was able to pursue an ecclesiastical policy ultimately intended to reduce the Scottish church to subservience and to bring it into nearer conformity with the Church of England.

James's reasons for undertaking such a policy are plain enough. Though strongly influenced by Calvinist theology, his whole life as king-resident in Scotland was overshadowed by his hope of the English succession. Before 1603, then, his great desire was to placate and win the support of every important group in England who might help realize this hope. After 1603, when he had settled himself in an English environment, his experiences there and his conscious desire to be a truly British king influenced him to undertake a social and political reconstruction of his native kingdom which amounted to something like a revolution from above. Scotland must become as England was in all things that mattered to monarchy. Moreover, James, though he retained a kind of stubborn loyalty to his native land, was also convinced that Scotland needed civilizing along English lines. Strengthened by this sense of rectitude and backed by the power of English kingship, he pushed ahead steadily but with consummate caution toward the achievement of those ends. What might have happened to church-state relations in Scotland if James had not been for the greater part of his life directly or indirectly under English influences is difficult to say. It is doubtful that without them his attitude toward the presbyterian system would have been very different. The Scottish presbytery was in many ways a "fearful engine" whose powers would have been difficult to check in any society where central government was weak, but it is also true that if James had had no other expectation than that of Scottish kingship, he might have found some means of living with it. As it was, he remained convinced all his life that presbyterian government was inherently incompatible with monarchy and that it had to give way to some form of episcopacy.

For their part, the leaders of the kirk, while they reserved the right to censure the king when the occasion demanded, and developed

a Hildebrandine theory of two kingdoms to explain the relationship of church and state,¹³ were not actually anti-monarchical in their sentiments then or at any time throughout the seventeenth century.¹⁴ What they wanted was a king who would act the part of a true Christian magistrate and direct his authority to the carrying out of God's will. In this sense, the naiveté of their political theorizing is almost pathetic. Even as they believed that everyone who read Scripture with an open mind and an absence of evil intent must come to their conclusions in matters of theology and church government, so they also believed that a Christian or even a pagan king, if he were not blinded to the truth, must conform his rule to their understanding of Christian magistracy. On this condition they were perfectly willing to accept monarchy, no matter how absolute, so long as it was infused with their own conception of the moral law; and they continually argued that they had no wish to circumscribe royal power.

Nonetheless, despite their protestations and the fact that even in the days of their power the leaders of Scottish Presbyterianism never attempted to set up a permanent constitutional machinery for the explicit purpose of limiting royal prerogative, there was an intrinsic difficulty in their position. By its very nature the presbyterian system with its graded courts and assemblies was almost impossible for any king to control directly. But this, strangely enough, was actually one of the least of its difficulties so far as secular government was concerned. The aim of the Scottish church was truly Calvinist in that it believed itself to be not a national church or an isolated sect but an integral part of a Christendom whose churches were soon to be reformed in the same way that it had been. Scots Presbyterians confidently looked forward to a time, seemingly made imminent by the religious wars abroad and their own successes in Scotland, when the whole of Christ's church would be governed by a great international assembly which would stand above the nations even as their own general assembly stood above the synods of the kingdom. In short, they looked beyond king and country to the hope of a Reformed ecumene which would transcend national or dynastic loyalties. Men were not bound to the Kirk or its teachings because these were peculiarly national but because both were manifestations of a divine universal authority. "I am grieved," wrote one divine in an effort to make this point plain to English critics, "that this should be put upon mee which a Heathen hath laid on his friend . . . he loved his countrey because his owne, not because his countrey. Seeing it's weaknesse to overlove a Nationall faith, because Nationall, and not because it's faith. Truth naked and stripped of all supervenient relations is love worthy. And there is a great cause of sorrow that all the Lords people should not mind one thing, and

sing one Song, and joyne in one against the children of Babel."¹⁵ This was a spirit of Christian extraterritoriality in the tradition of the medieval church and one which, in its way, was equally dangerous to the power of kings.

On reflection, the problems created by this belief must seem obvious. The Scottish kirk was and remained throughout its history anti-Erastian in viewpoint not solely on the grounds of polity or because its leaders paid lip service to the teachings of Calvin on the separation of church and state, but because they believed with the medieval churchmen, whom they sometimes quoted, in a theory which came very close to papalist teaching on the nature of the "two swords." They did not, however, claim a superiority for the spiritual over the temporal power but argued that the two were separate and coordinate.¹⁶ Implicit in such a view was the ancient danger that the line of demarcation between the two spheres must often become blurred. When this difficulty arose, Scottish churchmen were as quick as the medieval popes to demand that the temporal give way to the spiritual authority. In the end, it was the continuing insistence of James and, later, of Charles I that the secular must control the spiritual estate and that the kirk must be governed by the crown like any other national institution which drove the churchmen to resist.

In the protracted struggle that began shortly after 1596, when James undertook to restore episcopacy in the Scottish church, the ministerial order, though deprived of the support of the nobility by the distribution of ecclesiastical lands, did not give up easily. While the king sought to undermine the influence of the strongest Presbyterian elements by threats, intimidation, and a gradual increase of episcopal authority, a hard core of defenders kept up resistance in various parts of the kingdom. It was this tough knot of men who, in the face of great odds and a growing sense of hopelessness, held fast to their belief in Jerusalem's ultimate restitution. Here it is interesting to speculate as to what might have happened if the first two Stuart kings of Great Britain had only been given another generation in which to erode away the influence of these malcontents; for—though the fact is often forgotten—both James and Charles came very close to achieving the aims of their policy. With the passage of time there was an increasing tendency on the part of many Presbyterian sympathizers to endure and then to accept the inevitable.¹⁷ That James and Charles did not get the time they needed was due in the main to two reasons: first, because their political and economic policies gradually alienated many of the great landholders of the kingdom; and, second, because an influential segment of the ministry created and popularized a revolutionary legend compounded of the covenant idea, national tradition, and the hope of

restoring the universal church of Christ. An analysis of the first of these reasons is beyond the scope of the present inquiry. The second relates directly to the symbolism expressed in the National Covenant of 1638.

The growth of this revolutionary legend was the result of a combination of institutional and human qualities which went into the make-up of the Scottish church. The institutional strength of the presbyterian system has already been noticed. What we more frequently forget, however, is that the strength and effectiveness of any institution must, in the long run, depend largely upon the abilities and the *esprit* of the individuals who undertake to make it function. For that reason it is wise to bear in mind that the ministerial order of the Scottish church during the sixteenth and seventeenth century was probably as unusual a clerical body as the world has ever seen. From the beginning, the kirk attracted the ablest of the country's young men to its service, in part from a sense of religious obligation but also, it must be conceded, because of the intellectual and social prestige attached to the ministry. Though the prototype of the seventeenth-century Scots divine is certainly not one to win our admiration, it must be agreed that within the limits of his particular time and place he was an extraordinarily effective and even an extremely popular figure in Scottish life. At no time was he ever separated from his flock in interest or in economic position; and his often selfless service was to create for him over the centuries a public image which is reflected in what is now an almost unreadable body of hagiography. Above all else, the minister seems to have been a tireless ecclesiastical functionary whose efforts are little short of astonishing when we consider what was demanded of him by kirk and society alike. To a greater extent than perhaps any other group in Scotland, the ministers as a body reached out to influence every social class from highest to lowest, not always happily or humanely by our standards, but nonetheless effectively so far as the church's interests were concerned.

By exhortation and example these men during the opening decades of the seventeenth century kept alive a spirit of resentment and discontent with royal policy. To try them publicly was only to turn the courts into public forums where judges were reminded, as the Earl of Dunbar was in a trial of dissident ministers at Linlithgow in 1606, that "this solemn covenant, the King, and all his subjects, at his command, had renewed with God Almighty, that they should adhere constantlie to the true Reformed Religion, and established discipline of this Kirk, all the dayes of their life, under the paine of endless condemnation in that great day of the Lord; and let the King take to heart what befell the posteritie of King Saul, for his breake [ing] of not such

an oath as the covenant of God with Scotland."¹⁸ Exile was worse than useless, for exile only gave pamphleteers like the church historian David Calderwood, who fled abroad in 1618, an opportunity to express themselves with greater freedom in the Low Countries or the Huguenot towns of France from whence there flowed back into Scotland an endless stream of polemical literature. Short of capital punishment, which both James and Charles abhorred, or close imprisonment, which was impossible to prolong under existing Scottish social conditions, there was little the crown could do to check the spread of discontent. Men deprived of ministerial appointments or forcibly removed to other parts of the kingdom kept up a lively correspondence with former parishioners to remind them in times of public crisis, as the Reverend John Welsh wrote the Countess of Wigton in 1606, that they were bound to maintain Christ's kirk and kingdom by a special covenant for all time coming "under all the pains contained in the book of God, and danger of body and soul in the day of God's fearful judgment."¹⁹

In this fashion the practical application of the covenant theology created a widespread popular belief that Scotland was truly a covenanted nation. While it was still assumed among theologians that the divine covenant was restricted to the elect, the language of homiletics gave it a broader scope; and Scripture was searched for passages that would drive home a sense of covenanted obligation to Scottish congregations. In pulpit oratory Scotland became the hope of Christendom, a land chosen above all others for a special work of redemption. In the sweep of their enthusiasm popular preachers assured their flocks that the Scottish nation had been mentioned by the prophets. At Kirkmabreck in 1634 the Reverend Samuel Rutherford joyfully told his hearers of his discovery of Scotland's name and destiny in Ezekiel and the Book of Psalms.

Now, O Scotland, God be thanked, thy name is in the Bible. Christ spoke to us long since, ere ever we were born. Christ said, 'Father, give me the ends of the earth, put in Scotland and England, with the isles-men in the great charter also: for I have them among the rest. . . . Believe in the name and authority of the Son of God, I pray you believe, and read Scotland's Charter. Psalm ii. 8, xlv, and lxxii. Will ye then believe?'²⁰

The most important consequence of this broad interpretation of Scripture was the creation of an atmosphere of anticipation, of a sense of the imminence of some great divine event. Like Lenin's party vanguard in the Russian Revolution or the Jacobins in 1792, Scottish divines had prepared themselves and their auditors for a historical climax that would transform mankind. Its exact nature they could not foresee, but of its coming they had no doubt. There is little or no clear evidence that they deliberately plotted rebellion against the king long before

it occurred. Very probably they did not, but, in a manner not unlike that of latter day revolutionaries, they had a faith that history was on their side in the sense that God would provide them with an opportunity to carry out his will in his own good time. That moment came on a July day in 1637 when rioting burst in the streets of Edinburgh and men rose to defend their hopes of the vision that had been building for so long.

In conclusion, let me anticipate any thought that I may have overstressed the importance of this apocalyptic faith as a cause of rebellion by repeating that there were other kinds of discontent, but that these, while they added fuel to the flame of revolution, could not have been decisive had there not been a larger vision of something that transcended the exigencies of the Scottish environment. Because this vision of the Covenanters was cast in terms that sometimes seem vague or unrealistic to a secular-minded generation, we are still not entitled to say that it lacked true historic effect. Are we, in all conscience, more certain that the promises of secular redemption held forth by later revolutionary visions are, in fact, any closer to reality or any more appealing than the promise that men should "live again in the joy of Zion, with the assurance of election and the hope of salvation"?

1. Cf. James K. Hewison, "'Bands' or Covenants in Scotland, with a list of Extant Copies of the Scottish Covenants," *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 4th Ser., VI (1907-08), 166-7.
2. Cosmo Innes, ed., *The Black Book of Taymouth* (Edin., 1855), 162-72. The records of great Scottish families are filled with contracts of this kind. For other examples see R. C. MacLeod, ed., *The Book of Dunvegan* (Aberdeen, 1938), 43-50, and *The Miscellanies of the Spalding Club* (Aberdeen, various dates), particularly vols. 2 and 4.
3. John Lumsden, *The Covenants of Scotland* (Paisley, 1914), 77.
4. *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, IV, 783-7.
5. Lumsden, *op. cit.*, 13-20; J. C. Johnston, *A Treasury of the Scottish Covenant* (Edin., 1887), 23-4.
6. Richard Bannatyne, *Memorials of the Transactions in Scotland, 1569-1573* (Edin., 1836), 47-9.
7. W. Cunningham, ed., *Sermons of the Reverend Robert Bruce* (Edin., 1843), 70.
8. Rollock was in regular correspondence with Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor at Geneva, and the eminent theologian, John Piscator of Herborn. The extent to which Rollock's writings were published on the Continent is alluded to in a letter written to him by the Geneva divine, Simon Goulart. See William Gunn, ed., *The Select Works of the Reverend Robert Rollock* (Edin., 1844-49), I, 10, and II, vi-vii.
9. *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, from the Year MDLX* (Edin., 1845), Part Third: MDXCIII-MDCXVIII, 862, 869-70. See also David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edin., 1844), V, 407-8.
10. G. R. Kinloch, ed., James Melville's *Diary* (Edin., 1829), 234, 239-40; Calderwood, *op. cit.*, V, 436-7.
11. Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist* (1648). Part II: "A Survey of Antinomianisme," 50-51. See also James Durham, *Commentarie on the Book of the Revelation* (1660), 234-35; *A Practical Exposition of the X. Commandments* (1675), pp. 5 ff.; *The Law Unsealed* (1676), p. 5.
12. See David Calderwood, *The Speech of the Kirk of Scotland to Her Beloved Children* (1620), p. 5, and *The Altar of Damascus or the Paterns of the English Hierarchy, and Church-Policie obtruded upon the Church of Scotland* (1621), *passim*, as well as George Gillespie, *A Dispute Against the English-Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland* (1637), introduction. For this belief the leaders of the kirk had the warrant of King

- James himself, who, in 1590, had praised the Church of Scotland for its purity above all others. See Calderwood, *History*, V, 106.
13. A. F. Scott Pearson, *Church and State in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 79 ff.
 14. For examples of the thought of Covenanting leaders in this connection see Alexander Henderson, *Government and Order of the Church of Scotland* (1641), 68; *Sermon to the House of Lords, May 28, 1645*, p. 12; David Laing, ed., *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* (Edin.: Bannatyne Club, 1841-42), III, 18; and the statements contained in two famous Covenanting manifestoes: *An Information to all good Christians within... England* (1639), p. 5, and *A Remonstrance Concerning the Present Troubles* (1640), p. 5. Even Samuel Rutherford, whose *livre de circonstance*, *Lex Rex: the Law and the Prince* (1644), was the most extreme political statement made by any Covenanting leader, advocated at most only a vague kind of elective monarchy and that only in certain cases. See S. Rutherford, *Lex Rex*, p. 82.
 15. Samuel Rutherford, *A Peaceable and Temperate Plea for Paul's Presbyterie in Scotland* (1642), Introduction, p. 2.
 16. George Gillespie, *CXI Propositions Concerning the Ministrie and Government of the Church of Scotland* (1647), 19-20; *Aarons Rod Blossoming* (1646), introduction; *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords, August 27, 1645*, p. 48; and Alexander Henderson, *Reformation of Church-Government in Scotland* (1644), 12-13.
 17. Calderwood, *History* VII, 108.
 18. David Laing, ed., John Row's *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland. 1558-1637* (Edin., 1842), 239.
 19. W. Tweedie, ed., *Select Biographies* (Edin., 1845), I, 25.
 20. A. A. Bonar, ed., *Fourteen Communion Sermons by Samuel Rutherford* (Glasgow, 1878), 2nd ed., p. 116.

POPULAR RELIGION

- Inspirational Books in
- America
- LOUIS SCHNEIDER and
- SANFORD M. DORNBUSCH

Books of salvation and inspiration have long been a striking aspect of American culture. The names of Norman Vincent Peale, Fulton J. Sheen, Harry Emerson Fosdick, and others have become household words for millions of people who have bought their books and, presumably, found them satisfying.

What do these books have to offer their readers? What kinds of religious needs do they meet? What are their implications for religious and social action? For business morality? For mental health?

To answer these questions, the authors of this book have systematically studied a wide and representative sampling of American religious inspirational literature published since 1875. Analyzing its content and examining it in a wide cultural and religious context, they have found it to be strongly "man-centered" rather than "God-centered," oriented towards this world and its goods rather than toward salvation in God. And they conclude that, in its preoccupation with peace of mind and soul, with power and success, and with conformity and adjustment, it has often obscured the very religious principles and heritage it purports to convey.

212 pages \$4.50



At your bookseller, or directly from the publisher:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS,
5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois

In Canada: The University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.

PROTESTANTISM AND CAPITALISM IN PRE-REVOLUTIONARY ENGLAND

CHARLES AND KATHERINE GEORGE, *University of Pittsburgh*

It has become a truism of historical thought that some degree or kind of positive relationship exists between the ideology of Protestantism and the psychology of early capitalists.¹ Statements of the nature of this relationship have varied, however, and have been often based upon inadequate sampling of the relevant literature or inexact analysis of Protestant social theory.

The purpose of this paper is to survey the compatibility, or the lack of it, between an important segment of Protestant opinion and the practices and ideas of nascent capitalism. The material in question consists of the writings and preachments produced by English Protestant divines in the seven decades between 1570 and 1640. Within these temporal limitations the literature has been intensively analyzed and has been constantly considered in the differing perspectives of Roman Catholic thought and the teachings of the other Protestant schools.

Because so much emphasis has been placed in this area of speculation upon the presumed distinction in spirit between Lutheran Protestantism and Calvinist Protestantism, the former being said to have maintained for the most part the framework of a traditionalist social theory while the latter alone afforded a suitable ethic for early capitalism, it should be noted at the outset that, theologically speaking, the literature of English Protestantism in this period is overwhelmingly Calvinist. Differing degrees may be no doubt detected in the intensity of this Calvinism, and the so-called Puritans may be perhaps defined as a group of particularly consistent and dedicated adherents of Calvinist theology, but those individual English Protestants who in the years involved can be cited as non- or anti-Calvinist constitute an extreme minority of the whole. Hence whatever the nature of the social ethic which emerges from these writings, it is assuredly a Calvinist rather than a Lutheran social ethic.

The theological context of the problem we are pursuing—the problem of the relationship in English life and thought between capitalism and Protestantism—is a very broad and historically deep one: it is no less than that primary tendency in the sophisticated religions to assume that the twin objects of human anxiety and entreaty—salvation in terms of immortal life on the one hand, and success in terms of mortal life on the other—are altogether mutually exclusive or that at least a state of permanent tension or antagonism exists between them. In the formulation of this dichotomy one would appear to be

dealing with a well-nigh universal ingredient of the religious mentality which encompasses the whole mechanism of sacrifice and which, even in the historical phases of its development, exhibits no simple dependence upon time, place, or social circumstance. Both Buddha, the prince, and Christ, the carpenter, reject the pomp and circumstance and the vanity of the world. Because of the nature of its social origins, however, Gospel Christianity does afford an especially pointed statement of the concept which, with reference to the glory of eternity, penalizes the rich and powerful in the world of time and rewards the poor and humble—there is, in short, the initial assertion at the least of a straightforwardly subversive doctrine that the first in the City of Man shall be last in the City of God. And throughout the history of Christianity a basic element in its theory tends to be this assumption of the existence of a negative correlation between social triumph in the one realm and spiritual triumph in the other.

Yet this is only one side of the story, for compromises with the human drive for worldly success have assuredly been effected in Christianity. Concessions to material viewpoints and worldly desires are evident, indeed, from the miracles of Christ (whose principal focus is the preservation of bodily life and health) through the long history (charted by Troeltsch and others) of doctrinal adjustment to the social *status quo* and to the demands of European ruling groups for religious support and confirmation. Thus there is no area in Christianity to which one can turn where both these conceptual elements—both the rejection of worldly goals and the acceptance and defense of them—are not present in some combination of relative rank and emphasis. Despite their evident opposition, neither pole of the antithesis is ever completely eliminated.

The Roman Catholic solution to this ideological tension in Christianity has been the construction of a double standard of morality by means of which the two emphases are separated to a large extent and placed in hierarchical relationship to each other: one emphasis becomes part of the way of life of the saint—the saintly cleric typically—who is indubitably heaven-bound; while the other becomes part of the way of life of the ordinary Christian who, if he does eventually reach heaven, will probably do so only after a further period of purgatorial trial and training. Those few who endeavour to follow the classic course set by the upper level of Roman Catholic morality are expected to abandon material ambitions in a thoroughgoing fashion—to the extreme limit ideally of which human nature is capable. The triple monastic vow of poverty, obedience, and chastity signalized this wholesale turning from worldly wealth and power which is felt to be essential for the truly dedicated soul. In the Roman Catholic drama of sanctity world

rejection and self-abnegation are primary and absolute essentials. The traditions of asceticism venture to attack, indeed, that ultimate desideratum of the individual—the comfort and soundness of the body, and even its survival. Thus the saint is left at last, and barely left, with but one tiny corner of the world to stand upon—his life. The greatest part of his interest and joy has presumably already moved to heaven.

No such extreme otherworldliness was possible, however, for the vast majority of Christians, if the work of the world were to be done and if society and even the church itself were to continue. And for them therefore another regimen was established which was much more relaxed and lenient in regard to material interests. The standards of the lower level of Roman Catholic morality occasionally become such, indeed, as almost to approximate to those of some primitive cult, the principal business of whose deity is to protect the health, support the battles, and promote the economic and social advancement of its adherents. But even where the lapse from spirituality was not so profound as this, great concessions were made on all fronts to the material desires of men for worldly success.²

Practices of physical asceticism were not expected, marriage was permitted, and the accoutrements of worldly status which the society viewed as legitimate were religiously sanctioned. There was more than moral allowance; there was active, positive spiritual hallowing of worldly success. The quality of excess was taken from wealth, the quality of presumption from power, if certain minimum religiously sponsored rules regarding acquisition and use were observed. What this second level of morality amounted to in practice then was that the way of the worldly—in terms, that is, of the proprieties of worldliness at the time—was made acceptable, though not in any sense ideal, as a Christian way of life through acknowledgment by the worldly of the institutional supremacy and spiritual leadership of the visible church.

The theoretical latitude for Roman Catholicism's support of worldly institutions is, therefore, very wide. There are historical reasons, but there is no logical reason, for example, why Roman Catholicism could not have provided as staunch a defense for the ideology and practices of a capitalistic and bourgeois society as it did in fact provide for the ideology and practices of a feudal and aristocratic one. But the double standard was so profoundly rooted in Roman Catholic doctrine that any life in the world, whatever its nature or function, was bound to be viewed as of second quality in comparison to the life of church and cloister. The irony of the situation was, moreover, that sanctity, rather than being, as a consequence of the scorn of worldly circumstance, more readily available, in the Gospel pattern, to the poor and humble

in society, came rather to be, in the centuries of Roman Catholic dominance at least, a virtual monopoly of those fortunately born few who could afford to reject the world and desert its responsibilities.³

Protestantism initially, consistently, and in all its forms undertook as a primary task the demolition of this Roman Catholic barrier between the two levels of morality. Thus the English Protestant of the period we are considering finds himself to be part of a general stream of Protestantism in his constant contention that there are not two ways to go to God but only one and that this one must lead directly from earth to heaven. The English Protestant, again like Protestants as a whole, endeavors to solve the tension between Christian spirituality and materialism by cutting off both of the extremes of the double solution characteristic of Roman Catholicism and then proceeding to occupy a single intermediate position. Relative to Roman Catholicism there is both a materializing of the spiritual and a spiritualizing of the material. Physical asceticism in all its forms is abandoned. More important, the ordinary domiciles and the usual occupations of the world are not to be fled or eschewed in the effort to achieve the utmost reaches of spiritual fulfillment. The intensest forms of religious experience, instead of being isolated in monastic cells, are to be brought into the housewife's kitchen, the carpenter's shop, the merchant's counting house, and the magistrate's palace.

I

Instead of distinguishing, as did the Roman Catholic, between two levels of living in the world, one which rejects and the other which accepts it and its limitations, the typical English Protestant distinguishes between the two aspects in which the world may be viewed: its natural soundness on the one hand, and its corruption (in a sense "unnatural") on the other. Thus Perkins, the greatest theologian English Protestantism produced, asks:

... if every man ... must shewe himselfe to be a pilgrime and stranger in this world. ... is it not a good state of life, for a man to contemne the world, and all things in it, and to betake himselfe to perpetuall beggarie, and voluntarie poverty?

And he answers:

The world in Scripture is taken divers ways: first, for the corruptions and sinnes in the world: and these must be contemned by all meanes possible. ... Secondly, for temporall blessings, as money, Lands, wealth, sustenance, and such like outward things, as concerne the necessarie or convenient maintenance of this naturall life. And in this sense, the world is not to be contemned, for in themselves, these earthly things are the good gifts of God, which no man can simply contemne, without injurie to God's disposing hand and providence, who both ordained them for natural life.⁴

There are many similar and some even more emphatic passages in

this literature, in which the believer is enjoined to look upon the world in terms of its temporal blessings as essentially good and apt for the service of the most Christian man, provided, of course, that he uses it aright. John Dod remarks that "all manner of goods and possessions are for the service of life, either to be for the necessary use, and reliefe thereof, or as ornaments and delights unto it, to make it the more comfortable."⁵ "Of gifts temporal," Lancelot Andrewes states, "the heathen have doubted whether they were good, to wit, riches, honour, etc., but the Christians are resolved that they are good."⁶ Even the sins and corruptions of the world are not in the world as such, the English Protestant asserts, but arise instead from man's wrongful use of the world. Richard Sibbes makes this point:

... wee must know it is not the *world* simply that draws our heart from God and goodnesse, but the *love* of the world; worldly things are good in themselves and given to sweeten our passage to Heaven; they sweeten the profession of Religion; therefore bring not a false report upon the world, it is thy falseness that makes it hurtfull, in loving it so much. Use it as a servant all thy dayes, and not as a Master, and thou maiest have comfort therein.⁷

Not the world, then, but man's misuse of it is the evil to be feared. English Protestantism, however, was fully as pessimistic as any branch of Christianity regarding the sinfulness of man and his consequent inability to use the world as God meant it to be used or to avoid immoderate love of worldly things. The initial presumption of the goodness of the world, in that it is the creation of a good God, becomes nonetheless in this literature therefore the basis for a far greater proportional emphasis on the danger of too much involvement in or too much dependence on it. The same Sibbes who has spoken above of worldly things as being "good in themselves and given to sweeten our passage to Heaven," also enjoins the Christian to labour "to know the world, that thou maiest detest it . . . the more we know the vanities of the world, and the excellence of grace, the more we will love the one, and hate the other."⁸

The term "world" is undoubtedly more often employed by English Protestant divines in the negative rather than the positive sense; that is, it is more often, even in the absence of modifying adjectives or phrases, a word which stands for inordinate love of the world or for those who are afflicted with such love and whose condemnation is symbolized thereby, than a word which refers merely to the temporal blessings whose essential goodness is assumed. Sibbes again explains this negative usage:

... the ungodly . . . are called the world because they swagger in the world, as if they were upon their owne dunghill there. . . . they have their name from that they love. . . . Now carnall men are in love with the things of the world. . . . This world must be condemned.⁹

In another treatise Sibbes states succinctly that "wicked men are called the world because they love it; and holy men are called heavenly because they are carried in their affections and wills to heavenly things."¹⁰

There is certainly no complete escape in English Protestant literature, therefore, from the ancient Christian tension between the pursuit of worldly and of heavenly goals. One might even argue, indeed, that in the analysis of the problem which these English Protestant spokesmen present, a solution is achieved which is very similar in basic logic to that offered in Roman Catholic thought. For the distinction which is made in English Protestantism between the world as evil and the world as good depends in the long run upon the manner of man's life in the world, and thus here likewise two levels of life may be said to exist: one of the saints who use the world as a highroad to salvation and the other of the damned who misuse the world that they may compound with committed sins their original reprobation. Yet even when this elementary continuum between the Roman Catholic and the English Protestant argument is acknowledged, there is still a difference, and, historically speaking at least, a very significant difference in emphasis and interpretation between the two. For the English Protestant saint, whatever the peculiar qualities of his approach to the world may be, is not in any way institutionally isolated from it but lives his entire life finally and entirely in its midst. And assuredly also by the very fact that the English Protestant saint can be or, rather, must be a saint while living in the world and being busy in its tasks, that world and its activities acquire an additional guarantee and advertisement of their positive qualities which Roman Catholic ideology does not afford.

No more than Roman Catholic permissive acceptance does the positive English Protestant sponsorship of the life of the world logically entail, however, allegiance to or support of any specific political or economic regime. One possesses at this point of the discussion only the possibility in the newer as compared with the older theology of fuller and more intimate integration between the interests and goals of faith and the interests and goals of whatever social system was recognized as legitimate in the time and place. The English Protestant divine of the period under survey intended this integration to mean, of course, the energetic penetration of the secular realm with what he considered to be Christian standards of conduct, yet, unconscious though he himself might be of the fact, the way was also opened more widely to the working of an opposite process: the adjustment instead of Christian standards to fit the standards of the world. It is the relatively greater flexibility of the English Protestant position which strikes one here as its particular characteristic. Since, unlike Roman Catholicism, Eng-

lish Protestant theology preserves no ecclesiastical or monastic area of fixed practice and idea, the faith is thrown, unreservedly, as it were, into the stream of time and change.

Despite the shifting quality of the logical ground they stood upon, the creators of the literature being analyzed did not hesitate to make pronouncements concerning specific social issues and policies, and, when they spoke, moreover, they did so always as if extracting their censures and commendations from God's own storehouse of eternal verities and from a clear conception on their part of the constitution of the good society. They wrote often and at length of wealth, for instance. Yet when one attempts to sum up what they had to say about wealth, its proper function in society or its place in the life of the Christian, one finds oneself confronted with contradictions, and, while certainty and absolutism characterize the manner of presentation, the term flexibility comes again to mind as most suited to the substance of the viewpoint which is presented. The English Protestant accepted wealth as the essence of worldly success, the foundation of honour and high place. Adams writes:

Observe that Salomon in the donation of the left hand couples together Riches and Honour: as if these two were for the most part inseparable companions. . . . First Riches, and then Honour: for it is lightly found, so much Riches so much Honour; and reputation is measured by the Acre. . . . Riches are the staires whereby men climb up into the height of dignitie; the fortification that defends it; the food it lives upon. . .¹¹

The English Protestant, then, recognized and had adjusted to the realities of his age, an age whose elite had come to be defined more by place and possession than by blood and military exploit.

In regard to the attitude toward wealth, the break between English Protestantism and the Roman Catholic tradition is partly here in the very acknowledgment of a changed society (though there is little consciousness that society in fact had changed). It is also to be found in English Protestantism's explicit acceptance of wealth, as of all other worldly conditions, as a feasible setting for the most strenuous spiritual life. "Now we tell you from him, whose title is Rich in mercy," Hall declares, "that ye may be at once rich and holy. . . . It is a true word of the sonne of Sirach which I would have you carie home with you, and write it as a fit Motto, in your counting-house. . . . Substance doth well in the hand, if there be not evill in the heart."¹² Andrewes, having observed that the blessed Abraham was "rich in cattell, in silver, and gold," assures the wealthy Christian that "one may be so rich and so use his riches together as they . . . no waies hinder but helpe forward his accompt with God. . . ."¹³ John Downname likewise comments:

. . . prosperitie is good when it is enjoyed by a faithful man, who being in Christ, hath recovered that right in all Gods blessings which

we lost in Adam. . . . it is good when as it is used . . . for the advancement of Gods glorie . . . and the furthering of our owne salvation. And if any such enjoy prosperity and thus use it . . . it is to be accounted unto them Gods singular blessings, and as a temporall pledge of eternall happinesse.¹⁴

Passages of this sort do occur in the literature (though they are not numerous) which establish the point that it is possible for the child of God to be at once wealthy and saintly, and which, taken by themselves, might appear even to affirm the existence of some positive correlation between prosperity and godliness. The least acquaintance with the intricacies of the English Protestant viewpoint, however, completely eliminates interpretation of it in such simple and materialistic terms. The blessings of the world, far from being seen as a reliable indicator of divine favor or the soundness of one's spiritual state, are universally asserted to be distributed indiscriminately by God to both the good and bad. There is, indeed, a very strong current of opinion (particularly strong in the so-called Puritan and hence most emphatically Calvinist segment thereof) which contends that by far the best for quality and the most for quantity of the gifts of the world fall to the share of the wicked rather than the virtuous. "For all outward happiness," Robert Bolton remarks, "are for speciall reasons, and by particular indulgence more often, and very plentifully in this world vouchsafed to the wicked and prophane."¹⁵ Downname states the same:

. . . doth not common experience teach us, that worldly prosperity is a step-mother to vertue, those being most destitute of it, who most abound in worldly things, and they most rich in spirituall grace, who are most wanting in them?¹⁶

The argument readily moves on from here, and wealth, so often linked with the wicked, becomes almost a wicked and certainly a dangerous entity itself, a web of temptation in which all but the spiritually strong are bound to be snared. And how few are spiritually strong! "Who seeth not," Adams writes, "that prosperitie encreaseth iniquitie; and where is more want, there is lesse wantonnesse?"¹⁷

In so far as capitalism is defined as involving the conscious, rational, and continuous pursuit of wealth—and for whatever purpose—the English Protestantism of this period cannot therefore be other than unreservedly anti-capitalistic. A great deal of commentary in this literature, moreover, is specifically directed against those economic practices in late 16th and early 17th century England which embodied important elements in the development of modern capitalism. English Protestantism takes a decisive stand, for instance, against interest on money, or usury, and a chorus of complaint arises against "cruell inclosures," engrossing and monopoly practices in general, forestalling, high prices, high rents, rigged markets, secret contracts, "binding poore men to unreasonable covenants," taking of high fees, and against the loss of

church livings to impropiators.¹⁹ When English Protestant divines invoke that classic theologian's theme—the evil of the times—as frequently they do, their primary emphasis tends to be upon the presumed wealth-centered interest of their age. “Men can well endure to sit telling and taking money,” Thomas Gataker observes, “and it were all day long . . . but to heare the word, but an houre . . . the most can hardly endure.”²⁰ Such competition for wealth is altogether incompatible with competition for godliness and the life of grace.²¹ Bolton thunders the warning:

A Christian dare not . . . gaine by any unwarrantable meanes . . . and therefore in this griping and greedy age, in the highest noontide iniquitie . . . he doth not commonly come to that excesse . . . of temporall things, which many times worldlings with wider consciences easily and immeasurably engrosse.²²

Yet inveigh against wealth and particularly against the pursuit of wealth though he may, the English Protestant divine never enshrines its opposite, poverty, in the Roman Catholic manner. Rather than seeing poverty as a social condition to be accepted and even cherished, for the sake of the opportunities for charity it may afford, the English Protestant tends to consider it as an evil to be questioned or even as a problem to be solved.²³ Where he finds social policies—he frequently cites some of the practices of nascent capitalism as being such—which unconscionably increase the numbers of the poor, he condemns them. Where he discovers “sturdy beggars” choosing poverty rather than the self-supporting labor they might obtain, he advocates punishment. In the case of the “truly poor,” of course—widows, orphans, the handicapped, the sick, the aged—he urges, nay he commands, charity, but more as a duty which the community must perform than as an exercise in godliness for the heaven striving soul. From the standpoint of the individual's search for salvation, furthermore, poverty, like wealth, is thought to be a state beset with hazards. “Both poverty and riches . . . have their temptations,” John Robinson declares,²⁴ and all English Protestants agree that neither is properly to be sought by the Christian. English Protestantism's rejection of poverty as an ideal of life for the Christian is made particularly explicit in the course of its energetic repudiation of the total pattern of monasticism.

From the analysis of wealth and poverty as dangerous extremes one seems logically to emerge with a commendation for some status of economic moderation in between. And indeed Downname does observe that “the meane estate . . . preserveth us from forgetfulnesse of God, irreligion and profaneness, which accompanieth prosperity . . . and from impatiency, murmuring and repining against God, to which we are tempted in poverty and adversitie.”²⁵ The usual assumption of English Protestantism is that the good Christian will occupy this “meane estate,”

in the sense at least that he may legitimately seek and will probably possess a suitable competence in this life: "God allwaies giveth for sustentation, though not for satietie," comments Arthur Dent.²⁶ Gouge assures the believer that "if thou get heavenly blessings, temporall things, so farre as they are needfull for thee, shall be cast in."²⁷ What constitutes this competence, however, is subject to a variety of interpretations. Hall explains:

It is true there can be no certain proportion of our either having or desiring the goods of this world since the conditions of men are in a vast difference . . . and it is but just and lawfull for every man to affect so much as may be sufficient, not only for the necessity of his person, but for the decency of his estate.²⁸

Any effort to state precisely at what economic point a man may or must consider his particular sufficiency to have been achieved is further discouraged by such observations as this from Robinson's writings upon the relativity of wealth and poverty:

. . . he is a rich man, who wants no outward means, wherewith to maintain himself, and his, plentifully, in that state of life in which God hath set him, whether high, or low: and he poor on the contrary, to whom the proportion is wanting. And hence it comes to pass, that there are poor kings and rich cobblers. . .²⁹

The flexibility of thought, evident in these last passages, which makes possible for the English Protestant divine a relatively receptive attitude toward the possession of wealth in the world, is, in the last analysis, merely another corollary of the conviction that all worldly conditions have been determined and assigned by God's will and Providence and that it is the Christian's duty to live contentedly in the place in which he finds himself. The whole resistance to the ascetic tradition is rooted in this doctrine, after all, which emphasizes the absolute supremacy of the divine over the human will. He flies in the face of Providence and sins therefore who seeks the cross which is not given him, as equally he does who strives for the prosperity which God has not seen fit through Providence to bestow. The injunction to dependence on God's design for every man, significant though it is as a thesis in the English Protestantism we are considering, never becomes complete quietism, to be sure; yet on the other hand, it does serve effectively to spoil characterization of this literature in terms of activist sponsorship of institutions or practices in the world except as they are merely the established proprieties of the time. The Christian is encouraged by the great weight of the argument we have thus far surveyed to accept the universe, both in its personal and its social character, and not to change it.

The first general statement which can be made therefore about the connection between capitalism and the social theory of English Protestantism before 1640 is simply that English divines had accepted, in

their own religious terms, of course, the new orientation toward worldliness and the one life in the world, which was also an aspect of the humanism of the Renaissance, and that they felt reasonably at home in a society in which wealth (still for the most part landed wealth) was becoming the acknowledged basis of power and prestige. They had, in short, decisively cut their moorings from the social bias and the dominant feudal and clerical philosophy of the middle ages. Likewise capitalism, whether as a system of ideas or a set of economic practices, participated in the same broad movement away from one and toward another pattern of thought and living. Protestantism and modern capitalism shared thus the same heritage of discontents and the same age of birth. Inevitably there were links, some of which have been noted in the process of this discussion. But on the basis of the analysis up to this point the association can hardly be stated in other than these tentative, general, and, from the standpoint of the religious ideology, relatively passive terms.

II

There is, however, a more aggressive aspect of English Protestant social theory to which adequate attention must be paid before attempting to sum up the exact nature of the relationship between capitalism and this body of religious literature. For it is in the doctrine of the calling that English Protestantism, like Protestantism in general, made its most significant contribution to a new view of society and of man's place in society. The doctrine in question concerns the particular rather than the general calling. Robert Sanderson makes the distinction:

The Scriptures speak of two kinds of Vocations or Callings: the one . . . the General, and the other the Particular Calling. . . . the General Calling, is that wherewith God calleth us . . . to the faith. . . . Here is no difference in regard of Persons: but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. . . . Our Particular Calling is that wherewith God enableth us, and directeth us . . . on to some special course and condition of life, wherein to employ our selves, and to exercise the gifts he hath bestowed upon us. . . . the thing whereunto men are thus called, is not one and the same to all, but differenced with much variety according to the quality of particular persons . . .³⁰

Perkins, who wrote an entire treatise on vocations,³¹ makes a further two-fold distinction among particular callings. He marks out, on the one hand, a category of personal callings, "such as be of the essence and foundation of any societie, without which, the societie cannot be"—in a family, the callings of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant; in a commonwealth, the callings of magistrate and subject; and in the church, the calling of the minister—; and, on the other hand, those callings "such as serve onely to the good . . . estate of a societie"—the callings of husbandman, merchant, physician, law-

yer, carpenter or mason.³² Commentary on this second type of "particular callings" by English Protestant divines is abundant, lengthy, and very detailed, and carries treatment of the subject well beyond anything attempted by either Luther or Calvin as individual theologians.

The English Protestant divine assumes and proclaims the necessity of a particular calling for every particular man, whether saint or reprobate. A man's proper calling is determined by the Providence of God and is matched by the possession of natural gifts appropriate to the tasks involved. Sanderson declares:

. . . that is every man's Proper and right Calling, whereunto God calleth him. . . . When therefore we speak of the Choice of a Calling, you are not so to understand it, as if it were left free for us ever, to make our Choice where, and as we list. The Choice that is left us, is nothing but a conscionable Enquiry, which way God calleth us, and a conscionable Care to take that way.³³

In addition to matching the talents of the individual who follows it, a calling to be suitable and legitimate, whether from the standpoint of natural or Christian law, must be socially approved as well. "A vocation or calling," Perkins asserts, "is a certain kind of life, ordained and imposed on man by God, for the common good." The whole moral, as distinct from the spiritual, function of the calling is summed up, indeed, in this fact of its social utility. Connecting and binding the members of society together through an intricate network of interweaving services, the calling assures that the maintenance of each shall be dependent on work oriented toward the benefit of all. With some emotion Sibbes invokes the fruitful quality of the calling:

Let us then strive . . . to be fruitfull in our Places and Calling: for it is the greatest honour in this world, for God to dignifie us with such a condition, as to make us fruitfull. We must not bring forth fruit to our selves. . . . Honour, Riches, and the like, are but secondary things, arbitrary at Gods pleasure to cast in: but, to have an active heart fruitfull from this ground, that God hath planted us for this purpose, that we may doe good to mankind, this is an excellent consideration not to profane our calling.³⁴

Since the whole moral function of the calling consists in its social utility, to pursue through the calling a non-social or a narrowly individual goal is to live immorally. English Protestant divines warn against the endeavor to gain personal profit or advantage by means of the calling. "And that common saying, *Every man for himselfe, and God for us all*," Perkins remarks, "is wicked, and is directed against the end of every calling, or honest kind of life."³⁵ "They profane their lives and callings," the same theologian continues, "that imploy them to get honours, pleasures, profits, worldly commodities etc. for thus we live to another end than God hath appointed, and thus we serve our selves, and consequently neither God, nor man."³⁶ The man who wishes to live virtuously in his calling is specifically enjoined to avoid ambition,

"a vice whereby any man thinking better of himselfe, then there is cause hee should, becomes malcontent with his particular calling and seekes for himselfe an higher place, and a better estate."³⁷ Hence constancy in the calling is assumed to be the only righteous course for most men in most circumstances and change is allowed only when, because of a previous error in choice, a man's calling is clearly inappropriate to his capacities and greater service to society would result from a readjustment.³⁸

While provisions regarding the moral function of the calling apply to all men, the spiritual function of the calling concerns, of course, only those few truly Christian and predestinate souls among them, since for them alone does the calling serve as a worldly arena for the demonstration of grace received and the proof of salvation promised. It is with these predestinate souls primarily in their view that our English Protestant sermonizers develop the calling as an aspect of the Christian life and assert its importance as the chief embodiment of a Christian's worldly, as distinct from his purely religious, duty. The religious duty and the duty of the calling are seen, in fact, to be inextricably intertwined. The calling becomes a kind, and an absolutely essential kind, of Christian worship. Perkins writes that "if a man be zealous for Christ, he must be zealous within the compasse of his calling; and not be zealous first, and then looke for a calling, but first looke for a calling, and then be zealous."³⁹ "Religion is no vocall profession," Sibbes asserts; "every man must have some calling or other, and in his generation, he must doe good. . . . We must serve God . . . in our life."⁴⁰

In the voluminous literature of English Protestantism, made up, as it is, of contributions from so many individual minds, the full revolutionary character of the Protestant doctrine of the calling emerges with particular clarity and impact. It is not so much that any really new ingredient is added to the formulas originated by the great pioneers of Protestantism as that potentialities are more completely realized in the vast variety of English sermons. The extent of the break from the outlook of Roman Catholicism can hardly be overstated. To begin with, the English Protestant doctrine of the calling presents a concrete embodiment of the general Protestant rejection of the Roman Catholic double standard of morality. It does more than this, however, for it goes on to establish so strong an affirmation of the world and of the value of life in the world that the concepts of asceticism, deep-rooted though they are in the Christian tradition, cease almost entirely, in this area of English Protestant thought, to have any valid relevance.

Weber has summed up the Protestant (and particularly the Calvinistic Protestant) doctrine of the calling in terms of a concept of

worldly asceticism. As we moved through the discussion of the calling in the literature under scrutiny, the Weberian interpretation came to appear less and less appropriate to the data we encountered. Much depends, to be sure, in these matters of historical analysis, upon the standpoint from which one makes one's judgments. Weber looked back on 16th and 17th century Protestantism from the standpoint of his own time, a time in which standards of life-enjoyment had become established against the background of which these early Protestant ideas appeared dour and self-denying. But the much more suitable procedure, historically speaking, is to attempt first to see an idea in the context of its own time and secondly against the background of the past from which it emerged. When the English Protestant doctrine of the calling is viewed thus, its essentially affirmative and non-ascetic nature becomes apparent.

There is a definite shift in this literature, for example, from the Roman Catholic emphasis on the penal quality of labor, and especially of manual labor, to a contrary emphasis on its positive, creative, and enjoyable aspects. Occasional references to the penal function of work are found in English Protestant writings, of course, and God's judgment on Adam in his fall is seen to provide the basis for the painfulness of toil. Yet the primary sanction for human labor as such is found, not in the fact that Adam sinned, but in the prior fact that he tended a garden in Paradise. Hall observes:

Paradise served not onely to feed his Adam's senses, but to exercise his hands. If happiness consisted in doing nothing, man had not beene employed; All his delights could not have made him happy in an idle life. Man therefore is no sooner made, than he is set to worke: neither greatnesse, nor perfection can priuledge a folded hand; he must labor, because he was happy; how much more wee that wee may be?⁴¹

In addition, though the Christian is warned of the iniquity of using the calling as a means for securing material reward, he is nonetheless assured that in connection with, if not as a consequence of, the diligent and God-fearing conduct of a proper calling, material reward may be confidently expected. The Christian, as we have previously noted, is urged to be confident of the provision by God of a sufficiency to meet his worldly needs, and he is expected to obtain this sufficiency through following his calling. "In every honest vocation," Dod declares, "wherein a man shall diligently and faithfully imploy himselfe there is abundance."⁴² "If a man," Preston concurs, "would be content . . . to use those talents that God hath given him, not for his owne, but for his Masters advantage; I say, if he would doe this, he shoulde finde God All-Sufficient."⁴³

The comfortableness of this English Protestant doctrine of the calling is further enhanced by the fact that relaxation, rest, and rec-

reation are thought to be essential parts of the Christian's regimen of life. The Sabbath, incidentally, though it is seen as a day of rest, is never positively asserted in these writings to be part of the recreational allowance. What is meant by recreation are other periods of time in the regular work-day week which are devoted to approved kinds of relaxation of mind and body. Moderation is urged in the enjoyment of lawful recreation, and there is an expected subordination of means to ends in the entire doctrine: just as the calling is a means subordinated to the end of total godly living, so recreation is a means subordinated to the end of the calling. "And therefore . . . hee God admitteth lawful recreation," Perkins notes, "because it is a necessarie meanes to refresh either bodie or minde, that wee the better doe the duties which pertain unto us."⁴⁴ That the anti-ascetic temper of English Protestantism is central to the support of recreation is evident, however, in this passage from the works of Adams:

They are too rigid and austere, that forbid lawfull delights: let no Teacher make the way to heaven more thorny, than God himselfe made it, and meant it. . . . I cannot beleeeve, that God will ever give a Papist thanks for whipping himselfe. Our lawfull pleasures are his pleasures. . . . That is a superstitious worship which makes the worshippers miserable. God delights not in our blood, but when the witsnesse of his glory calles for it. The world hath wages enough to vex us, we need not to be our owne tormentors. It is no credit to a man's holinesse that he condemns all recreation. Let me looke to please God, and then know that he hath made the world to serve me.⁴⁵

There is a second general aspect of the English Protestant doctrine of the calling which involves a sharp departure from Roman Catholic social theory, in its Thomistic formulation particularly.⁴⁶ We are referring here to the considerable modification by English Protestant divines of the social hierarchy of callings accepted and confirmed in the earlier creed and to their absolute denial of the existence of any spiritual hierarchy whatever. In regard to the first point—the social hierarchy of callings—the philosophy of Thomistic Catholicism had perpetuated the invidious distinction between mental and manual toil or the liberal and servile arts which the idealist philosophies of antiquity had championed. Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas had joined in the common concept which glorified the intellectual and contemplative way of life (and secondarily the governing or administrative role, whether in state or church) and assumed that the ordinary productive labors of the world would be performed by inferior natures. It is an extremely significant fact therefore that in this English Protestant literature the calling is linked so frequently to labor with the hands or, more accurately perhaps, that mental and manual toil are so frequently, indeed, so consistently, equated in the common dignity of the calling. The metaphors, the examples, the images employed in English

Protestant discussion of the necessity of work are drawn almost entirely from the terms and tasks associated with labor with the hands. The sheep to be watched, the vineyard or the garden to be cared for, the sweat that drops from the diligent worker's brow—these are the references which one meets repeatedly. "We must then," Robinson typically asserts, "mingle our own sweat with faith to make a sweet odour withal to God."⁴⁷

The English Protestant minister exhibits little tendency to deny or even seriously to modify the social hierarchy of callings as his time conceived it; he is not, in the period we are studying at least, a leveller in any overt sense. But what he does maintain (as neither Aristotle nor St. Thomas Aquinas maintains it) is the moral equivalence of all legitimate callings in that all, in being necessary to society, are in a basic sense equally necessary and that all, in serving a utilitarian function in society, are in a basic sense equally useful. "God hath so distributed the variety of his gifts with singular wisdom," Sanderson observes, "that there is no man so mean, but his service may be useful to the greatest: nor any man so eminent but he may sometimes stand in need of the meanest of his brethren. . . ."⁴⁸ Employing the typical metaphor of the husbandman, Adams likewise reduces the differences of rank and function in society to this same essential equality of service:

Every one thinkes himselfe Gods sonne: then heare this voyce, Goe my sonne. You have all your Vineyards to goe to. Magistrates Goe to the bench to execute judgement and justice. Ministers Goe to the Temple, to preach, to pray, to doe the workes of Evangelists. People Goe to your callings, that you may eate the labours of your owne hands. . . . every man to his profession, according to that station, wherein God hath disposed us. . . . The Incitation gives way to the Injunction, Worke.⁴⁹

This equality of callings in regard to their moral aspect is perhaps more a matter of implication than of direct statement in these writings and, in justice to the full complexity of the argument, should probably be defined as a relative departure from the classical and medieval viewpoint rather than as an absolute position in itself. The equality of callings in regard to their spiritual aspect, however—their relationship, that is, to the salvation of the soul—is stated so often and so emphatically by English Protestant divines that it emerges from their sermons as one in a small company of entirely unequivocal concepts. The linkage to fundamental Protestantism is close, of course, since we are dealing here with a particular application of the general Protestant insistence that salvation, whose mark is inward, cannot be limited or affected by any external condition of life or livelihood. To equate this viewpoint with complete denial of the value of works in the pursuit of salvation is, however, greatly to misrepresent the issue. Perkins specifically states that there will surely be at the Day of Judgment a "giving and rendring

to every man according to his workes," and that not the least of these works are those of a man's calling.⁵⁰ What the spokesmen of English Protestantism do assert again and yet again is that this evaluation of the work of the calling depends not at all upon the kind of calling involved but altogether instead upon the manner in which its duties, whatever they may be, are conducted and fulfilled. Thus Perkins declares:

Now the works of every calling, when they are performed in an holy manner, are done in faith and obedience and serve notably for Gods glory, be the calling never so base. . . . The meannesse of the calling, doth not abase the goodnesse of the worke: for God looketh not at the excellence of the worke, but at the heart of the worker. And the action of a sheeheard in keeping sheep, performed as I have said, in his kind, is as good a worke before God, as is the action of a Judge, in giving sentence, or of a Magistrate in ruling, or a Minister in preaching.⁵¹

Perkins hammers the viewpoint home with an even more dramatic illustration:

Now if we compare worke to worke, there is a difference betwixt washing of dishes, and preaching the word of God; but as touching to please God none at all: For neither that nor this pleaseth God, but as farre forth as God hath chosen a Man, and hath put his spirit in him, and purified his heart by faith and trust in Christ. As the scriptures call him carnall which is not renewed by the spirit and borne againe in Christs flesh, and all his workes likewise . . . whatsoever hee doth, though they seem spirituall and after the law of God never so much: So contrariwise he is spirituall which is renewed in Christ, and al his workes which spring from faith seeme they never so grosse . . . yea deedes of matrimonie are pure and spirituall . . . and whatsoever is done within the lawes of God though it bee wrought by the body, as the wipings of shoes and such like, howsoever grosse they appeare outwardly, yet are they sanctified.⁵²

Hall has much the same to say:

The homeliest service that we doe in an honest calling, though it be but to plow, or digge, if done in obedience, and conscience of God's Comandement, is crowned with an ample reward; whereas the best workes for their kinde (preaching, praying, offering Evangelicall sacrifices) if without respect of Gods injunction and glory, are loaded with curses. God loveth adverbs; and cares not how good, but how well.⁵³

Since the validity of the parable of the widow's mite is never entirely ignored and never denied in any Christian doctrine concerning the spiritual value of works, it can perhaps be argued that this English Protestant emphasis on the inward rather than the outward quality of a task is present, by implication at least, in Thomistic Catholicism too. But to argue thus is merely to state that all forms of Christianity are alike Christian in that they all contain the fundamental elements of Christianity, self-contradictory though these elements may often be. It is certainly true that from one standpoint Roman Catholicism and Protestantism may both be seen as being joined in a common continuum of Christian ideas, but it is equally true that from another standpoint

significant differences of approach and interpretation may be observed. One of the most important and sharply defined of these differences, moreover, is clearly existent here in the contrast between the English Protestant and the Thomistic Catholic position on the spiritual value of works. On the one side we have the resolute assertion of the spiritual equality of all works *qua* works, and on the other side the tendency to divide works into categories of more or less meritorious, first on the basis of the hierarchy of the double standard of morality as more or less ascetic, and secondly on the basis of the hierarchy of a feudal world, as more or less worthy, dignified, or involved with the rule of others, some of the merit for whose virtuous actions accrues, in this often highly mathematical system, to the original source of guidance. Thus, while in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas we have found no single passage to match those most recently quoted above from Perkins and Hall, which proclaim the total indifference in regard to good works of all external considerations of dignity or kind, neither have we found in the writings of English Protestantism a statement to match the Angelic Doctor's declaration, contained in his *De Regimine Principum*, that the king who rules well over his subjects deserves and will receive a higher reward in heaven than any subject who simply lives well under his king.⁵⁴

In relationship to the doctrinal past from which he emerges, therefore, the English Protestant divine can confidently be said to celebrate work in the calling, as an aspect of Christian life, in a peculiarly wholesale and emphatic manner. His viewpoint is not wholly new, of course. Elements of it occur in the Gospels especially, in the moralizings of sectarian preachers on the fringes of medieval Roman Catholic thought, and even in the rules of established monasticism. What is original in English Protestantism, however, is the intensity and frequency of the sermons on the worth of work and the unhesitating application of these ideals to all social levels and all occupational groupings in English society. It is one thing to commend with condescension the godly labor of the serf or poor monk whose efforts keep alive the organic whole, feeding the higher organs of mind and might for their tasks of leadership and rectitude, or to advocate labor as a penance for the spirit of the proud; it is quite another thing to make work in a calling the *summum bonum* of the human spirit's striving for fulfillment in the world: the "categorical imperative" of priest or preacher as well as congregation, of ruler as well as ruled, of rich as well as poor.

Recognizing the significance in Protestant social theory of the doctrine of the calling, Weber has assigned to it the principal role in establishing a mutually sustaining connection between the Protestant ethos and the spirit of capitalism. Though our findings certainly coin-

cide with the Weberian hypothesis in its emphasis on the importance of the doctrine of the calling, they do not support any interpretation of this doctrine as capitalistic in nature or direction. Weber himself defines the spirit of capitalism as consisting essentially in the rational pursuit of profit. What is farthest from the English Protestant doctrine of the calling, what is specifically contrary to it, in fact, is this very rational pursuit of profit. The Christian pursues nothing in the calling except, through the proper performance of the duties it involves, the service of God and his fellow man. Even the Christian's simple maintenance (which surely is to be socially and economically distinguished from profit, that excess of reward beyond maintenance or immediate expense)—even the Christian's simple maintenance is to be seen as an incidental consequence of diligence in the calling rather than as an object of endeavor. Profit entails enriching, furthermore—an increase of wealth in the hands of the person undertaking the profitable enterprise. The English Protestant divine, as we have seen, attacks from many angles any orientation of life toward the increase of wealth. Through exhortations to constancy in the calling and other related arguments, he encourages and sponsors, just as does his Roman Catholic forebear, a stable rather than a mobile society. And the mobility which he does allow to individuals finds its basis, not in the rational pursuit of profit by these individuals, but in the occasional readjustments attendant upon society's need for the most efficient service from all its members.

That we have found little in the English Protestant doctrine of the calling which justifies the application of the label "capitalistic" to it is not to deny or diminish the extent of the break which this doctrine represents from the social theory of medieval Roman Catholicism. In this doctrine of the calling, which is in its essence broadly Protestant, as much Lutheran as Calvinist, we find as in no other single concept perhaps the ideological watershed between the ancient-medieval and the modern mind. To link it particularly to capitalism, which is merely one aspect of modernity, is to limit and weaken rather than to strengthen its real potentiality. In the face of certain social pressures, in the hands of certain groups, this doctrine was capable no doubt of acquiring a capitalistic coloration, but as we meet it here in these English Protestant pronouncements in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, its scope is much greater and its reach is socially much more profound—as a viewpoint whose primary focus is not business activity but productive toil, it is not so much a bourgeois as an anti-feudal, not so much a capitalistic as an industrial ethic.

1. For an introduction to the problems involved see especially Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (2 vols., N. Y., 1931); Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London, 1930); Lujo Brentano, *Die Anfänge des modernen Kapitalismus* (München, 1916); R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (N. Y., 1926); the essays of Talcott Parsons, for which see the bibliography in *Essays in Sociological Theory* (rev. ed., Glencoe, Illinois, 1954); W. S. Hudson, "Puritanism and the Spirit of Capitalism," *Church History* (March, 1949); Herbert G. Wood, "Puritanism and Capitalism," *The Congregational Quarterly* (April, 1951); and the bibliographical essay by Tawney in *The Times Literary Supplement*, January 6, 1956.
2. See Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Chicago, 1948), *passim*, for an insight into the extraordinarily independent spheres of religious and secular life in medieval London, which left the parish clergy almost completely isolated from the merchant and artisan classes. In the view of the 15th century London merchant, the clergy existed to operate the traditional mechanisms of the religious establishment; they were not expected to preach against unethical practices or to supervise right conduct in the business community (even though the merchants were probably aware that in the Thomistic scheme of things their total way of life was to some degree spiritually suspect). This is an important aspect of the "double standard" of Roman Catholic morality. The function of the clergy *vis a vis* the business community in 15th century London more nearly resembles that of 19th century London than it does that of Reformation London. For in Reformation London perhaps the most remarkable feature of merchant and artisan life was its penetration by the ideals of the Protestant pulpit. It is this hold on the city (and country) elite which is the great—if temporary—triumph of Protestant ideology.
3. See Katherine and Charles H. George, "Roman Catholic Sainthood and Social Status," *The Journal of Religion* (April, 1955).
4. William Perkins, *The Workes* (3 vols., London, 1612-13), III, 102-3.
5. John Dod, *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition... of the Proverbs of Solomon* (London, 1609), 20.
6. Lancelot Andrewes, *Works* (11 vols., Oxford, 1841-54), VIII, 314-15.
7. Richard Sibbes, *The Saints Cordials* (London, 1637), 187-8.
8. *Ibid.*, 188-9.
9. *Ibid.*, 100-101.
10. Sibbes, *Beames of Divine Light* (London, 1639), 15.
11. Thomas Adams, *The Works* (London, 1629), 872-3.
12. Joseph Hall, *The Works* (Oxford, 1863), I, 716.
13. Andrewes, *XCVI Sermons* (London, 1629), 315.
14. John Downname, *The Christian Warfare* (London, 1633), 369.
15. Robert Bolton, *The Workes* (4 vols., London, 1631-41), IV, 56.
16. Downname, *op. cit.*, 557-8.
17. Adams, *The Works*, 1147.
18. See Charles H. George, "English Calvinist Opinion on Usury, 1600-1640," *Journal of the History of Ideas* (October, 1957).
19. See John Donne, *LXXX Sermons*, in *The Works* (6 vols., London, 1839), III, 217; Hall, *Works*, I, 717; IV, 786-90; Arthur Dent, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven...* (London, 1601), 200-205; and Christopher Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church* (Oxford, 1956), for a definitive discussion of the complicated economic abuses relating to the church.
20. Thomas Gataker, *Certain Sermons...* (London, 1637), 144.
21. *Ibid.*, 141-47.
22. Bolton, *Workes*, IV, 283-4.
23. Cf. Christopher Hill, "Puritans and the Poor," *Past and Present* (November, 1952) and V. Kiernan on the same subject, *Past and Present* (February, 1953).
24. John Robinson, *Works* (3 vols., London, 1851), I, 125.
25. Downname, *op. cit.*, 375-6.
26. Dent, *op. cit.*, 116.
27. William Gouge, *A Guide to God to God...* (London, 1626), 30.
28. Hall, *Works*, IV, 17.
29. Robinson, *op. cit.*, I, 122.
30. Robert Sanderson, *XXXVI Sermons* (London, 1689), 205.
31. Perkins, *op. cit.*, vol. I.
32. Perkins, *op. cit.*, Dedictory Preface.
33. Sanderson, *op. cit.*, 215.
34. Sibbes, *Bowels Opened...* (London, 1639), 17-18.
35. Perkins, *Works*, I, 750.
36. *Ibid.*, 757.
37. *Ibid.*, 773.
38. Bolton, *op. cit.*, 48.
39. Perkins, *Workes*, I, 194.
40. Sibbes, *Beames of Divine Light*, 184.
41. Hall, *Works*, II, 836.
42. Dod, *A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the 11th and 12th Chapters of the Proverbs of Solomon*, 122.
43. John Preston, *The New Covenant...* (London, 1630), 178.
44. Perkins, *Workes*, I, 774.
45. Adams, *Works*, 1130.

46. St. Thomas Aquinas has served throughout this study as the particular point of reference for our summations of the social theory of medieval Roman Catholicism. In the rich literature of controversy and commentary surrounding the Angelic Doctor viewpoints undoubtedly exist which differ from his and which in some instances may approach more nearly to the viewpoints of the Protestant writers we are analyzing. But in the light of Roman Catholicism's own long and often avowed acknowledgment of the preeminence in the Church of St. Thomas and the structure of doctrine he erected, one is surely justified in employing him as the spokesman *par excellence* of the Roman Catholic position for the period with which we are con-

cerned. It is in his works, moreover, that one finds most fully developed that tension between Christian philosophy and an idealized feudal society which constitutes the basis, and, in one sense, the whole essence of the difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant social theory.

47. Robinson, *Works*, I, 116.

48. Sanderson, *op. cit.*, 56.

49. Adams, *Works*, 419.

50. Perkins, *Works*, I, 777.

51. Perkins, *op. cit.*, I, 758.

52. *Ibid.*, 391.

53. Joseph Hall, *Holy Observations* (London, 1607), 137.

54. See Katherine Archibald (George), "The Concept of Social Hierarchy in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Historian*, XII (1949), 50.

In Memoriam

William Walker Rockwell

Dr. W. W. Rockwell, former associate professor and librarian of Union Theological Seminary, died at the age of 83, on May 30, 1958.

Dr. Rockwell was for many years a prominent member of the American Society of Church History. Many of the older members will recall the zeal and success with which he promoted its growth. This was true not only during the years in which he was Secretary of the Society (December 1911 to December 1917) but thereafter when he served as chairman of the Committee on Membership, and as member of the Council. As Librarian of Union Theological Seminary he habitually made himself available to persons engaged in research, and even his casual conversation was replete with bibliographical and other information profitable to students and scholars. He had an extensive private library and his reading was wide and up-to-date. His written contributions were of high quality, though not so extensive as might have been expected by those acquainted with his scholarship. His Marburg dissertation, *Die Doppelhe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen* (1904) is a study of recognized authority. Dr. Rockwell was President of the Society in 1926. His presidential address "Rival Presuppositions in the Writing of Church History" was the basis of the article under that title in *Papers of the American Society of Church History* IX, (1934) 3-52. In this valuable paper we see the author's characteristic interest in Roman Catholic theological and historical studies.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The Council of Chalcedon and the Christology of Severus of Antioch." By V. C. Samuel. (Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society, Bangalore, India). Yale University, 1957. Director: Roland Bainton.

This work calls in question our traditional understanding of the Chalcedon doctrinal statement as a synthesis of theological principles contained in the various ways of thinking then current in the Church, and of its opponents as Monophysite heretics.

On the strength of a detailed study of the primary source materials connected with the three Councils—the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448, the second Council of Ephesus in 449 and the Council of Chalcedon in 451—the author shows:— (i) the leaders of the Council of Chalcedon had no appreciation for the Alexandrine theological tradition, and they did not seek to conserve its principles; (ii) the deposition of Dioscorus of Alexandria was a flagrant violation of all norms of justice and fairness; and therefore (iii) Eastern branches of the Church which had maintained the Alexandrine theological tradition were forced to assume a stand in opposition to Chalcedon.

The question whether there is any basis for the charge that these Eastern Churches were Monophysite is taken up on the strength of a discussion of the Christology of Dioscorus and a few of his renowned followers. The ablest and the most erudite theologian of these Churches in the sixth century was Severus of Antioch. The author has made extensive use of Severus' writings to show that the sixth century anti-Chalcedonian theologian had excluded every heresy known in his day, and that his positive statements on the faith had conserved all principles of orthodoxy so far recognized by the Church.

"Thomas Hooker, A Study in Puritan Ideals." By Hubert Ray Pellman (Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Va.). University of Pennsylvania, 1958. Director: Thomas P. Haviland.

Thomas Hooker's importance for the student of early New England Puritanism is established by the estimates of his contemporaries as well as by historians and scholars from his day to the present.

Hooker was greatly concerned with the intricacies of the conversion process. He never successfully resolved the conflict between Calvinistic predestinarianism and freedom of the will; he held to both and urged men to be ready to cooperate with God if and when He came to save them. However, as the outstanding preacher of experiential religion in his day, he was redemptive in his outlook and preached the love of God as much as the wrath of God.

Hooker's otherworldliness did not exclude the secular. The natural gifts of God are not to be despised but are to be transmuted into spiritual good. Sex—to use an example of a natural human impulse which it is commonly believed Puritans tried to ignore or stifle, to the warping of personality—was to be accepted but channeled into love, which would culminate in pure, normal family life. He stressed the person-to-person relationship in mutual covenanting, which he regarded as the basis of society. His high regard for rectified human reason and for knowledge led to his stressing the importance of a literate church and community. His own education included not only excellent theological training but also acquaintance with secular literature. His inquiring mind gave room for scientific interest.

Hooker was not democratic in the modern sense. In his theocratic setting, however, he stressed the democratic elements in Congregationalism, espe-

cially the extension of power to the people in the congregation and the curbing of the power of the elders. In secular government he inclined toward a more democratic way than John Cotton and John Winthrop, Jr., with whom he disagreed sharply on this point.

Hooker's literary theory, based on his theology, emphasized communication as the only worthy goal. An exponent and practitioner of the direct style, he excluded mere ornamentation or anything which detracted from getting the message across. His writing is characterized by sincerity, liveliness, cogency, concreteness, directness, and the controlled use of such elements of rhetoric as parallelism, alliteration, cadence, and effective tropes. Though generally his use of rhetorical devices was in harmony with his basic literary theory, his writing exemplified the fact that Puritan literary style was different from the Anglican in degree rather than kind.

"The Development of Secularism in Education in the Northwest Territory Prior to 1860." By Douglas MacNaughton (Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio.) The University of Chicago, 1956. Director: Sidney E. Mead.

The purpose of this dissertation is to show how secularism developed in education in the United States, using Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and particularly Michigan as case studies. Beginning with New England in the seventeenth century, the relevant factors included: the materialist motive of success; such concepts as the freedom of man, the law-abiding character of the universe, and the progress and perfectibility of man; the appearance of the sects; nationalism; education as a means to social control; the faculty psychology; the appearance of the Sunday School; the pre-occupation of the religious leaders in the West with the job of evan-

gelization; the expansion of education in science, which tended to crowd religion out of the curriculum, and led to specialization, relegating religion to a department of instruction from its role as an integrating factor in all education; the science of teaching, which fostered the feeling that religion is too difficult for public school children.

It is the contention of this paper that the fear of sectarian education which began to develop in New England in the 1820's, and later spread to the West, would not have brought about secularism in education had it not been for the other factors mentioned above.

"John Fiske: Cosmic Theist." By H. Burnell Pannill (Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.) Duke University, 1952. Director: Prof. H. Shelton Smith.

During the late nineteenth century, many of the writers and lecturers on religious and historical themes were influenced by the studies of evolution. One of the most popular of these writers and lecturers was John Fiske, (1842-1901). The productive period of his life coincides with the period in which evolutionary studies had their greatest influence on American thought and the catholicity of his interests and the resultant literary products provide a good basis for the study of this influence. The purpose of the dissertation is two-fold: first, to demonstrate that Fiske, as a philosopher of history and religion, was indebted to the liberal tradition in American Christianity of the early nineteenth century, and that he never departed essentially from that tradition; second, to show that Fiske's extended use of the methods and results of the evolutionary science of his day was in the direction of finding a method through which he could demonstrate the validity of his convictions about the nature of God, man, and history.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Birth of the Gospel. By WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957. xxi, 232 pp.

W. B. Smith was one of the last adherents of the Christ-myth school, whose work has been almost uniformly—and rightly—ignored by New Testament scholarship in the present century. This book, finished thirty years ago, has been edited by Addison Gulick, who prefaces it with an "orientation" which makes plain the extremely rigid principles by which Smith worked. The introductory chapter threshes a good deal of old straw in its effort to show that the Son of Man conception in the *Similitudes of Enoch* influenced early Christian ideas. If, as scholars have often suspected, the *Similitudes* are Christian rather than Jewish (they are not found at Qumran), the resemblances adduced are not surprising. But Smith is determined to prove that the gospel contains nothing but historicized apocalypticism; and in an appendix on "the chronology of the early gnostic sects" he argues that New Testament sayings come from the gnostics rather than vice versa. This conclusion is absolutely untenable.

There is historicized apocalypticism in the gospels, as H. Conzelmann has shown (*Die Mitte der Zeit*, Tübingen, 1954, dealing with Luke); there are "proto-gnostic" expressions in Paul and in John, as Bultmann and his followers have argued. But the conclusions which Smith drew from the evidence he used give a completely misleading picture of the development of early Christianity. As a reaction from "factual" treatments of the life of Jesus we can understand and sympathize with the book; but our sympathy does not extend to accepting it as in any way a reliable account of the birth of the gospel.

ROBERT M. GRANT

University of Chicago

The Early Church: Studies in Early Christian History and Theology. By OSCAR CULLMAN. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. (Translated by A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press; London: The SCM Press, Ltd., 1956. 217 pp. \$4.50.

These ten essays are so well chosen, translated and arranged that we miss nothing of the impression of unusual clearness, perspicuity and coherence characteristic of Dr. Cullman's greater works. Many exegetical contributions will at the same time enrich and challenge scholarly discussion (e.g. equation between *Paradosis* and *Kyrios*, distinction between Kingdom of Christ and Kingdom of God); but the basic theme is, how the Church's relation to the New Testament is inseparably a historical and a theological one. As we read in the first essay ("The Necessity and Function of Higher Criticism," 1949), "serious exegesis must always be concerned to shed light upon the different theological ideas contained in the Bible, and it must pass beyond the circumstances in which these were expressed" (p. 3). But this "beyond" does not mean "apart from" or "behind" history. "Redemptive history (*Heilsgeschichte*) . . . claims to be at once a part of world history and the very norm which gives world history some direction" (p. 7).

On the other side, the better the Church understands itself, the more it is willing to seek in the New Testament the critical norm of the historical development of its own institutions. According to the second and third essays ("The Origin of Christmas," 1947, and "The Plurality of the Gospels as a Historical Problem in Antiquity," 1945), both the celebration of Christmas on December 25th and the plurality of the canonical Gospels are not the results of some accidental historical pragmatism nor of some unhistorical speculations (whatever part such things may

have played), but of a real theological concern. Can we say "that the Gospel had to be recorded by several writers in the apostolic period, since it was impossible for this revelation, which claims to be more than mere biography, to be reproduced by one person in all its fullness" (p. 50; reviewer's italics)? What kind of "necessity" or "impossibility" should this be? (Such apodictical expressions occur also elsewhere in this book.) Dr. Cullmann apparently does not think of an abstract kind of necessity, but rather of that irreversible subordination of our Church to its norm, which is the coming of Christ into history.

With the relations between this norm and the Church which is to follow it, the fourth and fifth essays deal ("The Tradition," 1953, and "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," 1941, 3rd ed. 1950). With them we have reached the center of both Dr. Cullmann's theology and this book. In "The Tradition," going out from the Roman Catholic criticisms of his book *Peter*, he tries to get beyond the traditional opposition between "scripture plus tradition" and "scripture without tradition." 1) "Tradition" in the positive understanding of the word is not strange to the New Testament. Jesus Christ "appears as the content of the *paradosis*, but he is at one and the same time *its content and its author*" (p. 68). The apostolic tradition "is designated as *Kyrios*" (p. 75), "so that there is no antithesis between apostolic tradition and direct revelation" (p. 74).

2) Thus, together with Christ, the apostles appertain to the unique centre of the *Heilsgeschichte*, to "the period of direct revelation, or the period of incarnation" (p. 76). The post-apostolic Church recognized this. Instead of regarding its "ecclesiastical tradition" as a continuation or completion of the "apostolic tradition," it declared the latter to be a "canon" of the former, thus "subordinating itself to the apostolic tradition" (p. 87). "In creating a norm the Church did not desire to be its own norm" (p. 92). Dr. Cullmann here does not deal with the details of

the history of the canon (nor of "the so-called Apostles' Creed, a kind of last page to be added to the New Testament" [p. 96]—for this see his work *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 1943, 2nd ed. 1948, English translation 1949), but with the theological meaning in the creation of a canon, in which Church History, so to speak, defined its own origin and its own norm. This norm is, as we have seen, far from being merely a book.

The fifth essay (a prelude to "Christ and Time" and perhaps the best introduction to Dr. Cullmann's theological perspectives) shows at the same time the personal and the world-wide aspect of this norm: Christ, the exalted Lord, is the King of the whole creation, not only of his Church. But "the fact that the members of the Church are conscious of all this, that they know that Christ rules, and are therefore members of the Kingdom of Christ consciously, is what distinguishes them as a Church from all the other members of the *Regnum Christi* who may be its servants unconsciously" (p. 128).

The sixth, seventh and eighth essays ("The Return of Christ," 1944, 3rd ed. 1948, "The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body according to the New Testament," 1946, "Ho opiso mou erchomenos," 1947) deal with single problems of the eschatological situation. "In the Church of Christ eschatology is, in fact, an absolutely chronological concept, and it cannot be conceived as the expression of 'our permanent availability for existential decision' (Bultmann)" (p. 144). However, "the preaching of the nearness of the kingdom (of God, which, in contradistinction to Christ's kingdom, is, according to the fifth essay [p. 109] 'a purely future quantity') 'determines the present more than it characterizes the future' (p. 153). Such an "actualized eschatology," as we might put it, is due, according to the seventh essay, "to the life-giving activity of the Holy Spirit" (in Christ's body, the Church, and in our individual bodies), although the "transformation into a spiritual body is only possible when all things shall be created anew by the Spirit"

(p. 173). According to the eighth essay, the Gospel of John, when it speaks in terms of chronological priority (Christ being before Abraham and John the Baptist), seeks to express Christ's superiority in the history of salvation.

In the last two essays once more we see the two aspects of the New Testament with respect to Church History: that it is a historical document and that it is a norm of history. In "Samaritanism and the Origins of the Christian Mission" (1954) some words of the New Testament are used to cast light upon a too neglected phase in the history of Christian mission and expansion. According to "Early Christianity and Civilization" (1951), a Christian, faced with this world and its social and cultural values and problems, does not have a set of rules, how to change the world or how to withdraw from it, but is always to seek how to act responsibly in his faith, which means, according to the Epistle of Diognetus, (which on this point is "more in accordance with the apostolic faith" than, e.g., Tertullian): "Live in the world, but as strangers; live as strangers, but in the world" (p. 209).

MARTIN ANTON SCHMIDT
San Francisco Theological Seminary
San Anselmo, Cal.

Origen: *Prayer and Exhortation to Martyrdom*. Translated by J. J. O'Meara. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1954. 253 pp. \$3.25.

This 19th volume of the *Ancient Christian Writers* contains the two well known and well liked treatises by Origen on prayer and on martyrdom. It has been edited and translated by the Irish scholar John O'Meara, who has already contributed Augustine's "*Contra Academicos*" to this series. The text is carefully based on the critical edition of Paul Koetschau in the GCS. The translation is, as far as I checked, very accurate and yet not boring as Patristic renderings can be. Prof. O'Meara begins with a very short introduction to the life of Origen. Then he introduces his two topics, giving thus a good access to the reader who is not yet fa-

miliar with the text. This text itself has been minutely footnoted. (It is unfortunate that publishers can still not get away from the amateurish practise of putting excellent footnotes in the back of books where people do not read them!) The footnotes contain both discussion and reference. The theological trend follows in general Danielou. In this respect, one fact amazes me which does not particularly affect this book but which is still apparent here: the refusal to confront the Harnack and the Lietzmann school. It seems very vital to me that Patristic studies, even though they disagree sharply with the tendencies of the German critical schools, grapple intensely with their solutions.

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI

Garrett Biblical Institute

Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople. By NIKOLAOS MESARITES. Greek text edited with translation, commentary, and introduction by Glanville Downey. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1957. 70 pp. \$2.00 (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 47, Part 6, December, 1957, pp. 855-924).

The Greek text of Nikolaos Mesarites, which was originally written between 1198 and 1203 A.D. and published in the *editio princeps* of A. Heisenberg in 1908 (now out of print) again becomes available to scholars and interested readers together with the first English translation through the admirable efforts of Dr. Downey. He has provided the reader with an introduction to the life and works of Mesarites, three indices of scriptural passages, notable Greek words, names and subjects, and copious notes on the Greek text. He has drawn heavily on Heisenberg's researches but has lavishly enriched our knowledge with his own.

The text provides important architectural and art-historical information on a major Byzantine monument that is no longer in existence and a basilica

which some sources claim was built by Constantine the Great, namely the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople. (Professor Downey believes that the best evidence indicates that Constantius, Constantine's son, and not Constantine, built this church. Cf. p. 861, note 2.) The description of Mesarites provides a good deal of information about the city of Constantinople, Byzantine music and education, and a detailed description of the tombs of the Byzantine emperors and their families, who were entombed in the Mausoleums of Constantine the Great and Justinian. These mausoleums were connected with the church.

JOHN E. REXINE

Colgate University

Byzantium: Greatness and Decline.

By CHARLES DIEHL. Translated from the French by Naomi Walford, with Introduction and Bibliography by Peter Charanis. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1957. xviii, 366 pp. \$8.50.

There is an obvious inconvenience in offering to the general reader a book written in 1919. The specialists will hardly use extensively this popular book of the great French master. The general reader will probably have no leisure and no urge to continue his studies and may be easily overwhelmed by the thrill and vigour of Diehl's presentation, even at the points at which his treatment was inadequate and has been superseded by recent research. Professor Charanis, in his admirable Introduction, warns the reader of the controversial character of certain statements of Charles Diehl. He states explicitly that Diehl apparently had "no sympathy" for "formal theology." One should have made it stronger: what Diehl says of the religious aspect of Byzantine life and history is often strangely superficial and poor. This was, however, the common guilt of many Byzantine scholars of past generations, both in the West and in the East. Their erudition was often astounding, their critical insight unusually sharp. But their work must be repeated and redone at many points in

our days, because their vision of the whole was often so sorely distorted by the lack of congeniality with the subject of their study, devotedly and faithfully as their research was conducted. This lack of congeniality is especially felt in general surveys, of necessity synthetic and generalizing. This does not detract much from the literary value of such a book as the present volume of Charles Diehl. Only it must be read with caution. Probably all general surveys must be read with diffidence and caution, even those by great masters.

The book will certainly serve its purpose. In fact, it does exhibit the "Greatness" of Byzantium with convincing clarity and masterly skill, although the ultimate roots of this "Greatness" are not always presented fully. Fortunately, the general reader can be advised now to supplement his elementary initiation in Byzantine matters by reading another small book, also of the survey character, namely the recent volume by Professor J. M. Hussey in Hutchinson's University Library, *The Byzantine World* (London, 1957). The advantage of this small book is that it was *first* published in 1957, and therefore is actually "up to date."

Professor Charanis deserves special gratitude for his excellent "Bibliography," appended to the translation of Diehl's book. It will be warmly appreciated especially by the students in the field. Professor Charanis admits explicitly one major omission in his otherwise remarkably comprehensive list. Publications in Russian and other Slavic languages are omitted altogether. It may be true that many Byzantinists in our day have no command of Russian. One may, however, wonder whether it is an asset or a grave liability. But, as far as "Bibliography" is concerned, the omission of Slavic literature is a sore distortion of perspective. It is really ridiculous that the names of V. G. Vasilievsky, or of Theodore Ouspensky, or even of V. V. Bolotov, do not appear at all in the list. Studies by contemporary Russian masters, such as George Ostrogorsky, published in Russian or in Serbian,

are also omitted. Among the periodicals currently published the "Vizntijski Vremennik," published by the Soviet Academy, is not mentioned. In the old days it used to include articles also in Western languages and very often in Greek. Russian scholars of old were not only competent students in the field, but, to a great extent, they were founders and pioneers of the critical research of Byzantine History. This at least must be acknowledged. It is by no means an accident that even now the leading men in Byzantine research are André Grabar and George Ostrogorsky, trained and reared in the best traditions of the Russian historical school, although now outside of Russia. In the field of Byzantine history one must mention the superb IVth volume of V. V. Bolotov "*Lectures on the History of the Ancient Church*," written even earlier than Diehl's book, and still the best general presentation of the doctrinal life in the Eastern Church, from Nicaea I to Nicaea II.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Harvard Divinity School

A History of the Council of Trent. Vol. I. By HUBERT JEDIN. Translated from the German by Dom Ernest Graf, O. S. B. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder Co., 1957. 618 pp. \$15.00.

This is the first of three volumes of a monumental history devoted to the Council of Trent. The author, a professor of church history at the University of Bonn, has set himself a gigantic task. If we may judge from the first installment, Professor Jedin's work will be the standard history on the subject for many generations to come. His knowledge of the sources commands the highest respect and his presentation makes the reading of his book an exciting and often dramatic venture. Jedin's approach to many familiar problems is lively and stimulating, even if one cannot always agree with him.

The first volume represents an introduction. Professor Jedin describes in detail the arduous road which led finally to the inauguration of the Council. It is still a widespread opinion

among students of the period that the Council of Trent was foremost a reaction against the Lutheran reform. However, the author makes it convincingly clear that many discussions about the reform of the Catholic Church had taken place years before Luther appeared on the scene. The shock of the Schism at the end of the Middle Ages brought about the Conciliar theory which was from the beginning linked with a demand for reform of the Church. It is true that, during the early period, the Popes opposed the idea of a general Council because its defenders like Marsilius of Padua gave it an authority higher than the Pope's. But the idea as such was never dead and received new impetus during the Renaissance. This was due, as Jedin points out in line with generally accepted views, to the scandalous nepotism of the Popes, to their entanglement with the politics of the times, and the much hated centralized bureaucracy of the Curia. Reforms were proposed by outstanding men like Egidio Viterbo, the General of the Augustinian Order, and by Tommaso Giustiniani and Vincenzo Quirino, both of the Order of Camaldoli, whose reform program played a major part during the following period. It is, of course, well known that spontaneous movements like the *Devotio Moderna* tried to promote the reform of the Church before Luther.

Luther added another tension of major proportions to the many that existed already in the Catholic Church. It is Jedin's opinion that in the early years of the Lutheran reformation only a general council could have dealt adequately with his "heresy." There were many reasons why a council did not materialize before 1545. Neither Leo X nor Clement VII approved of a Council. In addition, their views were supported by influential men at the Curia like Cajetan, Campeggio, and Aleander. When finally Pope Paul III was willing to call a Council for the purpose of reconciling the two religions, he was faced with almost insoluble problems. Part of the trouble was that the Pope was drawn, or let himself be drawn, into the web of political intrigues which

had been cleverly woven by Charles V and Francis I. After the Council of Mantua had failed, for well-known reasons, the Pope became discouraged and looked from now on mainly for a reform of the Catholic Church.

It is entirely impossible fully to cover in a short review the wealth of material and suggestions which the book contains. Protestant readers will be interested in Jedin's presentation of Luther's religious ideas and his reasons for the reformer's popular success. Jedin's point that in the beginning the cleavage between Protestants and Catholics was not clearly defined should be noted. Nevertheless, he agrees by and large with the Protestant view that Luther had moved too far from the teachings of the Catholic Church to make a reconciliation possible. This reviewer somehow believes that the attempts to reunite the two religions made by the generation of Erasmus, were not a mere "dream" but represent a possible third view beside the conservative Catholic and orthodox Lutheran positions. The defeat of these endeavors does not necessarily prove that they were a fallacy. Jedin himself leaves the careful reader of the book with the impression that a "holier" Pope and less scheming rulers would have done a better job in the interest of the unity of the Church.

Jedin's history of the Council of Trent is a must for any student of the period. Though he writes from the Catholic viewpoint, the author appraises the many divers aspects of the 16th century, political, religious, and cultural, with an open mind, thorough knowledge and unusual understanding of the important personalities. Scholars in many fields, Protestants and Catholics alike, will draw inspiration from it for their own study. The book has an excellent bibliography and is enriched by many footnotes. The translation deserves highest praise as does the whole makeup of the book. Several beautiful plates enliven the text. The scholarly world will await with eagerness the next two volumes which the author is planning.

ELISABETH F. HIRSCH
Trenton State College

Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution 1660-1688. By G. R. CRAGG. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 326 pp. \$5.50.

What happened to Puritanism after 1660? This question has been largely ignored, even in the recent renaissance of Puritan scholarship. Hitherto we have been dependent on narrowly denominational approaches or on unsatisfying works like H. G. Plum's slight *Restoration Puritanism* and C. E. Whiting's more useful but diffuse *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution*. Now comes G. R. Cragg's telling of the story, a solid research study but one which leaves some critical questions unanswered.

Despite the title, this book is not really a study of Restoration Puritanism but of Restoration Puritans, a social history of "the life of a people under persecution" (p. vii). In this task the author has succeeded in painting a thorough and accurate portrait of the difficulties of nonconforming Englishmen between the Restoration and Revolution. His organization stresses the importance of persecution. The first four chapters deal carefully with government thinking and policies, the pattern of repression, the working of the machinery of arrest, trial, and imprisonment, and the reaction of the victims. The next three chapters consider family piety and corporate life, with special attention to worship and discipline. A further chapter summarizes the arguments in the "Clash of Ideas," the bitter debate between Anglicanism and Dissent in sermon and pamphlet. This chapter is perhaps less satisfying, though admittedly the material is voluminous and summary difficult. The work closes with a statement describing the condition of Dissent on the eve of toleration.

The outlines of this story have long been known, but the author does good work in filling them out with illuminating examples and exhaustive documentation. We learn a good deal more about local implementation of the Clarendon Code, the methods of informers, the vagaries of justices, and

the prejudices of the law. We catch glimpses of family and personal discipline in adversity which explain why this is the heroic age of Nonconformity. We gain a new appreciation of Quaker national organization, more effective than conservative Dissent in fighting legal battles, supporting families of imprisoned members, and recording and protesting sufferings. Again and again the authentic note of Puritanism appears—as when Joseph Alleine *in prison* rose at four in the morning and yet complained that the day was too short to perform his work.

What one regrets is that more assessment, analysis, and interpretation have not been provided in this book. The author alludes occasionally to the decay of zeal and orthodoxy and ends with a description of Puritanism as a largely spent force, but the factors responsible for this fascinating outcome are not specifically analyzed. Again, one wishes for a deeper appreciation of movement in Puritan thought. Nonconformist patterns of life and institutions drew both their variety and unity from their relation to different stages in the progress of the Puritan dynamic; they are too often discussed with inadequate reference to previous history and development. Lastly, one wonders if there is sufficient recognition of the tremendous impact of 1660 on the internal development of Puritanism. Indeed, is it possible to continue speaking of "Puritans" until 1688, as does the author? This is not just a quibble about terms. Puritanism and Nonconformity were different movements with separate problems and responses, and somewhere in this period men passed from the one to the other. After 1660 the fundamental theocratic drive to restructure church and society was crushed—permanently—at least in its traditional form. Historic Puritan ideas about godly discipline, sound politics, church-state relations, toleration, holy commonwealth, the Law of God and Nature suddenly became irrelevant, and new solutions had to be sought. "England's Circumstances are greatly changed," as William Penn said, "and they require new Expedients and other

sorts of Applications." This book genuinely illumines the scene, but that intellectual transition from Puritanism to Nonconformity has still to be described.

J. F. MACLEAR

University of Minnesota

Der Junge Zinzendorf. By ERICH BEYREUTHER. Marburg an der Lahn: Verlag der Francke-Buchhandlung, 1957. 238 pp. 8.80 DM. (Paper, 6.90 DM).

So much has been written about Count Zinzendorf (mostly in German) that, as in the case of Luther, it is difficult to produce anything new. However, also like that of Luther, Zinzendorf's personality seems never to lose its power to bewitch scholars into further study. Beyreuther, a church historian of Leipsic, has produced nothing essentially new in the story of the count's first twenty-two years, but he has given us new perspectives.

The biography is divided into six chapters entitled: "The World of the Old European Nobility," "Henrietta Katharina Von Gersdorf and the Little Lutz," "The Count a Pupil in the Paedagogium at Halle," "Cavalier Among Wittenberg Students," "The European Grand Tour," and "Bound and Yet Free." The author pictures a more normal boy and young man than has been traditionally conceived of without detracting seriously from the piety associated with Zinzendorf. An illuminating portion of this study is the account of August Herman Francke's work at Halle. Francke emerges in a favorable light, with a deeper understanding of the young count than he has usually been credited with.

The motif of the book is Zinzendorf being born and bred a nobleman. This has often been used to explain the less attractive side of the man, such as his running a one man show. In Beyreuther's hands almost the opposite is true, for the nobility he portrays is not the stereotyped Junker class, but the more gracious type of the Austrian tradition. If one does not push the analogy too far, one can compare the

life of the young Zinzendorf to that of the aristocracy on southern plantations in the United States. The environment produced men of culture and charm who were masters of themselves and others. If Zinzendorf dominated, it was because those about him unconsciously sensed the presence of this kind of leader. Beyreuther says:

If Zinzendorf was a free lance Christian, different from the original creative Luther and from the Lutheran church world of his day, different also from Spener, Francke, the Wuertemberg Pietists, the Enthusiasts and the Spiritualists, different from the men of the Enlightenment, it was certainly in part because he was at home in this world of the nobility. In this the way was marked out for him, and in it he always felt at ease and never deviated from it (P. 25).

For the scholar who uses German only as a professional tool *Der Junge Zinzendorf* is reliable biography based largely on primary sources. Without footnotes, the book nevertheless has a full list of sources at the back for each chapter. The archives at Herrnhut and Halle have furnished much of the material for this study. For the person whose knowledge of German is sufficient for enjoyable reading this volume is a delightful book. In it the Baroque period of the early eighteenth century comes to life. It whets the appetite for a sequel now in preparation by the same author, *Zinzendorf und die sich allhier beisammen finden*.

JOHN R. WEINLICK

*Moravian Theological Seminary
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania*

The Study of Missions In Theological Education. By OLAV GUTTORM MYKLEBUST. Vol. II. Oslo: Egede Instituttet, 1957. Agent: Forlaget Land of Kirke, Oslo. 413 pp. N. Kr. 29.50.

The present volume completes Dr. Myklebust's study of "world evangelization" as a recognized discipline in Protestant theological education, the first volume of which was published in 1955. (See *Church History*, March 1956, pp. 91-92.) The author continues to investigate the subject of missions in the curriculum against the broad background of the world-wide concerns

of the Church, theological trends, and missionary developments. The period covered is 1910 to 1950. The teaching of missions is also related to research and scholarship in the field, and the list of important titles published in the various countries is a very helpful feature of the book. Against this background there is then narrated almost year by year what happened to missions as a subject of instruction in the theological faculties and seminaries of Europe, Great Britain, and America. It is safe to assume that, after this minutely detailed study of hundreds of theological schools, no other person can match the author's knowledge of the curricular offerings, structure, and requirements of these institutions on two continents.

The era of missionary cooperation from the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 to 1945 brought about in academic circles an increasing recognition of the significance of missions for Church and theology, and this resulted in the multiplication of professorships and lectureships in Germany, the Scandinavian countries, and the United States. Great Britain resisted this tendency. The five post-war years, 1945-1950, which are characterized by a new view of missions as a "partnership in obedience" between old and young churches in world evangelization, further stimulated this development. American predominance in foreign missions is reflected in the numerous professorships and course offerings in missions in the seminaries of the United States. However, the large number of American teachers are overburdened with lecture courses and produce few scholarly publications compared with their few European counterparts. There is a complete roster of professorships existing in 1950. The study of missions by the mid-century could be said to have achieved status as an independent discipline. However, "apart from the United States of America, up to 1950, the study of Missions had been admitted, not to the Temple of Theology itself, but only to what may not inappropriately be described as the Court of the Gentiles."

In Europe it is an "optional extra." The author is a protagonist for its acceptance as an essential requirement. He does not accept the view of some British theologians and some in America that "what is needed in missionary instruction and research is, not the institution of a new subject, but the teaching of the usual theological disciplines with a missionary emphasis."

The final chapter on "Some Significant Conclusions" makes the following observations. The teaching of missions has been stimulated in Europe by the new emphasis on missions as the function of the Church rather than of voluntary societies of interested individuals, while the tendency to regard missions as belonging to practical training has worked against its adoption into the theological curriculum. As the connection between mission and unity becomes clearer in the Ecumenical Movement, theological education is increasingly viewed in an ecumenical perspective. The Presbyterian and Reformed Churches apparently have taken the lead in recognizing missions as a discipline and in educating for "world churchmanship." The slowly-won recognition of history of religions as a theological discipline, to which missionaries have contributed so much, has aided the cause of missions as a related discipline. While "all types of theology—Confessionalist, Biblicist, Pietistic, dialectic, liberal and fundamentalist, as well as the several currents of thought of a mediating type—have contributed to the building up of the new discipline," "there is small doubt, however, that it is to the exponents of 'Biblical' ('conservative' or 'positive') theology that our subject is pre-eminently indebted." The "practical" orientation of American theology has led to American leadership in the field.

R. PIERCE BEAVER
University of Chicago

Religious Freedom in Spain—Its Ebb and Flow. By J. D. HUGHEY, JR. Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1955. 211 pp. \$3.00.

Dr. Hughey, professor of practical theology at the Baptist Theological

Seminary at Rüschlikon—Zürich, Switzerland, is one of the Southern Baptist missionaries who helped the Baptist churches in Spain rebuild their life in the first years after the Spanish Civil War and World War II. Out of his practical experience of the difficulties in that country he was led to investigate the historical roots of the official Spanish intolerance. The results of his inquiry and the pattern of his findings, first drawn together in the form of a doctoral dissertation at Columbia, are in this book given fuller treatment and a more readily accessible form. *Religious Freedom in Spain—Its Ebb and Flow* is becoming a reference-book of permanent value for all those who have to do with Spain, whether as representatives of churches or as government officials.

Although the author's description of the ups-and-downs of religious liberty in Spanish history can only be summarized here, it is important to note that his affirmations are founded on the abundant documentation alluded to in the 27 pages of notes and the 7 pages of bibliography with which his book concludes. The first chapter and the last but one give lucid exposition of the rise of the special Spanish concept of "Catholic Unity" and the re-invigoration of that concept under the Franco government. The origins of this "Spanish Dream" are aptly suggested by a quotation offered from a 19th century historian who has great popularity among Falangists today: "Spain, evangelizer of half the planet; Spain, hammer of heretics, light of Trent, sword of Rome, cradle of St. Ignatius—this is our greatness and our glory: we have no other." The triumph of this vision in our generation is soberly stated in the juridical terms of General Franco's most enduring monument, the 1953 Concordat with the Holy See: "The Apostolic Roman Catholic religion continues to be the only one of the Spanish nation and will enjoy the rights and prerogatives which it should have in conformity with divine law and canonical law."

The seven "middle chapters" of Dr. Hughey's work tell with vivid detail the

story of the rise of a more liberal trend in Spain in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The ferment of modern times came to the country with Napoleon, and in spite of subsequent reaction Cayetano Ripoll, a school teacher put to death in 1826 at Valencia, is the last person in Spanish history to be executed on charges of heresy. The Revolution of 1868 led quickly to the establishment of freedom for both public and private observance of all religions, and Protestantism soon had its first organized churches on Spanish soil, with an eager hearing in several parts of that country. Under the short-lived Provisional Government, as under the First Republic which lasted but three years, various Protestant denominations took root, and while later pressures brought consolidation and limitation of activity, the Protestant movement has not disappeared, nor even shrunk, in the ninety years that followed. The Restoration of the unstable monarchy soon led to the replacement of religious freedom by religious toleration, a toleration which was applied to Protestantism with varying degrees of hostility or comprehension until the fall of the monarchy in 1931. The Second Republic not only re-established religious freedom, but also, for the first time in Spanish history, the complete separation of church and state. Dr. Hughey shows with utter candor the "petty, almost vindictive anti-clericalism" with which Republican leaders implemented this constitutional separation. He re-counts the high expectation with which Protestants greeted the coming of freedom and the dawning disenchantment as they discovered that the prevailing atmosphere, so unlike that of 1868, was rather indifferent to all religion. While Protestantism therefore had no significant influence on general culture under the Second Republic, it was naturally one of the first victims of the Nationalists as they rose to power through the tragic and bloody Civil War. It has often been the chosen scapegoat of Falangist polemic as, under Franco, "Catholic Unity" has become the dominant theme of a regime in search of a rationale that would enlist the intellec-

tuals and find response in the hearts of the masses.

The author, in his "Conclusion," does not despair of his theme. Those who combat religious freedom in Spain are not today the only voices heard in the land. As Roman Catholics in other lands ask searching questions of their co-religionists in Spain, pointing out the advantages that confessional peace has elsewhere conferred, "it is altogether possible that Catholic leaders will decide that intolerance is not expedient in Spain . . . hurts the nation . . . breeds anti-clericalism . . . hurts the Roman Catholic Church" itself.

Dr. Hughey closes, saying: "It is probably idle to hope for full religious liberty under the present régime, but it is not unreasonable to hope for broader toleration; and sooner or later the tide of full religious freedom will again come in. The good of the nation and the spirit of the times demand it." Humanly speaking, this is the confident expectation by which Spanish Protestants look toward the months and years just ahead. This study should be a great encouragement to them.

HOWARD SCHOMER

Chicago Theological Seminary

A Rauschenbusch Reader. Compiled by BENSON Y. LANDIS. With an interpretation of the Life and Work of Walter Rauschenbusch by Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957. 167 pp. \$3.00.

In the current Rauschenbusch renaissance this book adds very little. To be sure it is good to have digests from the major publications of the Rochester social gospel pioneer. Yet this has been done in two other books: D. R. Sharpe's *Walter Rauschenbusch* (1942) and Benjamin E. Mays's *A Gospel for the Social Awakening* (1950). Sharpe summarized the major books. Mays utilized a topical arrangement (Kingdom of God, sin, etc.). Landis presents copious extracts preceded by a brief introduction giving the social setting for each book.

Perhaps the keenest contribution of this book is the essay by Harry Emerson Fosdick, who was personally acquainted with Rauschenbusch. This

essay conveys a genuine affection along with a critical spirit. It suggests that the economic formulations were the most immature. Fosdick surveys the vigorous socialism of the early social gospel, concluding with the following passage: "In view of all that has happened in recent decades—Russian communism, the rise and fall of totalitarian states, the radical changes in American capitalism, the amazing growth of organized labor, and the increasing recognition of government's responsibility for the welfare of the people—one wonders how much rethinking and rewriting Rauschenbusch would feel required to do were he alive today." The rich catholicity of Rauschenbusch was a foundation from which a revision would have come just as it did in Niebuhr.

Meanwhile, two things are needed in Rauschenbusch research: first, a fresh compilation of hitherto unpublished materials such as his earliest writings in the German language, which were pietistic in outlook, and his initial essays on social questions sent forth during the Hell's Kitchen pastorate in New York (1886-1897); second, a deeper, richer theological framework is needed to discover that he was not a mere echo of the liberal voices of his era but a considerably more complex figure drawing on other theological influences.

DOVAN E. SMUCKER
Presbytery of Chicago

The Ministry in Historical Perspectives. Ed. by H. RICHARD NIEBUHR and DANIEL D. WILLIAMS. New York: Harper & Bros., 1956. 331 pp. \$5.00.

1956 and 7 saw the publication of the three volumes which constituted the results of the "Survey of Theological Education in the United States and Canada," undertaken by Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Williams and James Gustafson.

The first, "The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry," was written by Niebuhr to set the contemporary task of the theological school within the present situation of the Church and its

ministry. The third, written by the three investigators, "The Advancement of Theological Education," attempted to set forth in a reflective rather than a reportorial manner, the picture of contemporary theological education so as to illuminate its dilemmas and suggest possible lines of advance.

This middle volume traces the changing shape of the conceived task of the ministry down through the centuries, and presumably its function in relation to the other volumes is twofold—to trace the process by which the present day ministry in America has acquired its present characteristics, and to provide a living sense of the whole tradition against which the present can be judged. If this be so, then we could question the omission of Eastern developments in the early period, and of non-American patterns in modern times. For while these have had little influence in the development of American patterns of the ministry, it may well be that our understanding of what its present task should be would be enriched by this wider perspective.

Nevertheless, this is a valuable book as the names of the contributors would lead us to expect—John Knox on the Primitive Church, George Williams on the Ante-Nicene and Later Patristic Periods, Roland Bainton on the Middle Ages, Wilhelm Pauck on the Reformation, Edward Hardy on Priestly Ministries in the Modern Church, Winthrop Hudson on the Puritans, Sidney Mead on Evangelical developments in America to 1850, and Robert Michaelsen on the subsequent period.

All the articles are well written. There are, of course, questions concerning balance. For example, one wonders whether Pauck is historically justified in paying such scant attention to left-wing concepts of the ministry. However, if the value of a book such as this is to raise queries in our minds concerning the present role of the ministry, and to help stimulate our search for a more adequate theological training, it should serve its purpose well.

COLIN W. WILLIAMS
Garrett Biblical Institute

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIAN ART

by D. Talbot Rice



An authoritative account of the development of Christian art—from its primitive foundations through the early medieval period, with particular attention to the Byzantine world. Illustrations include 4 color plates, 72 black and white photographs, and 22 line drawings. \$7.95

D. TALBOT RICE, a well-known author of a number of books and articles on art, is Watson-Gordon professor of the history of art, Edinburgh University.

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

Christendom's Most Comprehensive Commentary

If you don't have a complete set of THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE, now is the time to buy it. Now you can save when you buy the entire commentary that the JOURNAL OF BOOKS AND RELIGION says "has the vitality of Christian experience and conviction, the inspiration of genuine scholarship." Now you can purchase this complete twelve-volume biblical survey for only \$89.50—a saving of \$15.50, if you buy the volumes individually.



The 12-volume set

\$89.50

Single volumes, \$8.75

Phone your bookseller and order your set today!

ABINGDON PRESS

Guide To PHOTOCOPIED MATERIALS

The American Historical Association is preparing a *Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials in the United States and Canada*, under a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. The *Guide* will be a desk reference book, paralleling the *Guide to Historical Literature*, that will tell where to find important bodies of microfilmed and other photocopied materials and how to use and procure them. It is expected to be published late in 1959.

The Association's Committee on Documentary Reproduction, with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of experts from the Library and Archival field, is supervising the collection of materials and editing. In this work the Archives section of the Canadian Historical Association is co-operating. The *Guide* will locate photocopied holdings of historical manuscripts by standard union list practices, according to traditional subject and period fields of history. This information is now being collected through co-operation with archives, libraries, and historical societies in both countries. Duplication of effort is currently avoided through the exchange of reports with the *Union List of Microfilms*. The method of preparing the text anticipates the possible issuance of supplements.

The Editor solicits the aid of historians in both countries in the discovery and accurate description of holdings of photocopied manuscripts wherever they may be. He welcomes information that will assist him in making the *Guide* as complete as possible. The Editor is Dr. Richard W. Hale, Jr.

Please address correspondence to him at:

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Copley Square Campus

65 Winter Street, Room 421, Boston 14, Mass.